

DVP.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

STUDENT PROBLEMS ON THE CATHOLIC CAMPUS

COMMITMENT TO INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

STAYING ALIVE IN HIGH SCHOOL

Volume 30, Number 1

June 1967

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

LC
493
J45
1967/68

Our Contributors

FATHER JOHN P. LEARY, S.J., is the President of Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington. His brief article was written in reply to the remarks made by Father James W. Sanders, S.J., in the January issue of the JEQ.

FATHER PATRICK RATTERMAN, S.J., is the Vice-President for Student Affairs at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio. His article is divided into four parts, only the first of which is published in this issue of the JEQ. The other three parts will be published in subsequent issues.

FATHER JOHN E. BLEWETT, S.J., is presently in charge of the International Center for Jesuit Education recently established at the Curia in Rome. He recently visited the United States and Latin America in the interest of international education and co-operation.

FATHER WILLIAM J. O'MALLEY, S.J., teaches English at McQuaid Jesuit High School in Rochester, New York.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

JUL 18 '68

397805

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

Volume 30, Number 1

June 1967

CONTENTS

ALL VESTIGE, NO VANGUARD: A REJOINDER

John P. Leary, S.J. 3

THE VISION OF CHRIST AND CHRISTIAN FREEDOM

Student problems on the Catholic campus

Patrick H. Ratterman, S.J. 8

THE AMERICAN JESUIT AND COMMITMENT TO INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

John E. Blewett, S.J. 26

STAYING ALIVE IN HIGH SCHOOL

William J. O'Malley, S.J. 41

THE JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, published in June, October, January, and March by the Jesuit Educational Association, represents the Jesuit secondary schools, colleges, seminaries, and universities of the United States, and those conducted by American Jesuits in foreign lands.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

A. WILLIAM CRANDELL, S.J.

Managing Editor

PAUL V. SIEGFRIED, S.J.

ADVISORY BOARD

An editorial advisory board is composed of the regional directors of education in the several Jesuit provinces:

JOSEPH T. BROWNE, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
JAMES L. BURKE, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
BERNARD J. DOOLEY, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
EDWARD A. DOYLE, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>
JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JAMES E. FITZGERALD, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
HERMAN J. HAUCK, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
ADRIAN J. KOCHANSKI, S.J.	<i>Wisconsin Province</i>
JAMES J. MCGINLEY, S.J.	<i>Buffalo Province</i>
JOHN V. MURPHY, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
JEROME A. PETZ, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
WILLIAM D. RYAN, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
JOHN F. SULLIVAN, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
JAMES F. WHELAN, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR
1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

COPYRIGHT, 1967
JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

All Vestige, No Vanguard: A Rejoinder

JOHN P. LEARY, S.J.

Recently I received a long distance call from the student body president of one of our Jesuit high schools. The substance of the call was this: our seniors have read the article by Father Sanders in the Jesuit Educational Quarterly on "The Jesuit University: Vestige of the Past or Vanguard of the Future." Practically all the move has been toward the big state schools since. If Jesuits feel this way about their own colleges why take a chance. However, they had also read a little later on an article penned by myself in the fall issue dealing in another way with the problem. Would I come over and talk with the seniors about their difficulties? I agreed, and have again read the article on "Vestige or Vanguard."

The comments by Father Sanders are mostly in favor of the vestige theory. Vanguard is brought in, it seems to me, as prudential afterthought. There is hardly a significant point made to justify a valid conception of vanguard. All the arguments say vestige. So, though the title is non-committal, the substance is stacked one way.

In general I feel this kind of negative, over-generalized and imprecise thinking does damage. Some of our younger Jesuits who feel they are very modern, are, in my judgment, backward. They want to give up in areas where the Society has immense influence. This means it can shape outlook, legislation, decisions about our whole society. We live in a society where power bloc wrestles with power bloc. This is where the action is. It is in the best tradition of Ignatius, Ricci. Relinquishing such a platform (which means a place where you are speaking and people are listening), in favor of the "new apostolate" (undesignated and romantic—the inner city, the slums) strikes me as naive.

Living in the baser parts of town and reaching one's hand down to the down and out is great. And I'm for it. But continued exploration of avenues to lift them up more than on a basis of day to day social work, of reclamation, is great too. It's the old story of prevention, foresight, organized foreaction versus the *ad hoc* mercy job, identification with the helpless. This latter option matters enormously. It is deeply incarnational, but it's only one part of a general strategy of vision and implementation, how

to distribute resources and manpower. Pressures and outlook applied where they will do the most good—this can be a kind of more consummate discretion. The “new” apostolate, on the other hand, is a sort of a revival of the Dorothy Day kind of approach, effective but very limited. It will have recurring success because the impact of person on person is great. But it has limits too.

Let’s take a few remarks from the “Vestige or Vanguard” article and ask some questions.

1) Theology in our schools is often 19th Century. It is improving, but not fast enough.

How true is this statement? And how fast should it improve? How can you measure and effectively criticize the rate of change? If it’s the Jesuits whose attitudes are changing too slowly won’t they carry the same frame of mind into Inner City, Nicaragua or the University of New Hampshire—all those other greener pastures? Or do we put half the troops on the shelf? Is this part of the “young’s” openness, that they are closed to the middle aged and old?

2) Our discipline is authoritarian. People will grow if you give them responsibility. We alienate by reluctant adjustment.

Haven’t all colleges gone through the discipline crisis? Why uncritically single out our schools? Read the school papers of Oregon, Vanderbilt and Columbia. And could the idea of giving total self responsibility to the students be too unqualified and faulty? Do they always show that they respond maturely to simply internal pressures? Doesn’t life “outside academe” always involve necessity, external pressures, being at work on time, doing what you’re told to do? I’m for liberty too. The maximum possible. But couldn’t it be an adult obligation to continue some direction, guidance, a schooling in realism? And how reluctant are we to adjust where we should? Is there a place, on the other hand, ever to resist a change or suggestion about innovation which seems unwise? I deplore this fetish of the new for its own venturesome sake.

3) We don’t have enough money. The state schools of commensurate size are getting ten times as much as ourselves. We are getting less competent professors.

However you add it up, does money really and ultimately make the great school? It helps, yes. But in bare facilities explosive

discourse has occurred and probably will again. Chrome and sophistication can encrust, can mute the challenge; breakthrough will probably come from little sparrow situations where the searcher specialized in ideas, originality, the urge to humanism—none of these purchasable commodities. Affluence can undo as well as do.

How does the author know we are getting less competent profs? For our size and age we are sending our fair share to graduate studies. Results count. This is being sociologically verified. From my six-year association with the Jesuit presidents, I have the very solid impression that in teachers we get our share and keep more than our share of dedicated competence. If some brand new state schools are getting huge sums of state funds I'm sure they will do some good with it. And I'm sure they'll go on proving how money, in the long run, does not build or sustain a great school.

4) The Jesuit school should concentrate only on undergraduate, liberal arts programs. Phase out professional and graduate schools.

If they can't be borne financially, I agree, but often they are feasible. Why eliminate, though, undergraduate schools of business, education, engineering? Why eliminate our Law Schools (a professional institution) when one considers the judges and Congressmen we help train?

5) The Society should not be nursemaid to the conservative thinking type of student who comes increasingly our way.

Are either of these contentions true? Premises from which conclusions are drawn matter. Are we nursemaids? Is our student the conservative type? What's the norm? Perhaps hanging on to a few basic values will be the new radicalism. Witness, in the political arena, Governor Reagan. We are getting "conservative" students? This is an opinion, in my judgment, that a few of the critics and the melancholies put together. That we have more than our share, I seriously question. Or that in the long run, our students are a fearful, fidgety, hang-onish lot I doubt too. Not the 2,000 I know at Gonzaga.

6) The administrators of our universities should see the time has come to abandon our schools.

Abandon is a well chosen word. Who is saying this, voice of Vatican II? How much have you consulted with broader constituencies than the inexperienced and your fellow disaffected? Are

the old grads, the alumni urging this? our students? the faculty? the Bishops? the public? Talk about neo-despotism!

7) We should move into new and exciting territory.

(I, by the way, am *for* diversifying our works, yet not abandoning the fruitful ones we have.) Where? Spell it out. Some specific thought should precede such grave decisions. And what are the norms for "exciting?" The problems and challenges on the university level are world shaking, a milieu in which much of tomorrow will be constructed. Must all our work be person to person in a racial crisis or with the physically poor? What of just the ignorant, the mixed-up, the influential but mal-oriented wealthy, the sophisticated not sane enough to be humble?

8) New attitudes on celibacy and the laymen's expanding role will result in a decline in vocations. There will not be the troops to care for the schools.

Temporarily, perhaps. But how can the disaffected tell this? Doesn't phase and anguish have its place among collectivities too? What about the vaunted long range point of view? Isn't it likely that an Order with the vitality, esprit and proven appeal of the Jesuits will flourish far more in the years ahead? The Sad Susans among us are not only sad in my judgment: they are misinformed, "63%" wrong in their facts and unrealistic, almost hopeless in their evaluation of the future. So often they forfeit audience by being indiscriminate. Even good criticism, this way, doesn't get its just dessert.

9) Jesuit Universities have failed to sell themselves to our younger men.

This is probably true. Our School of Business people tell me that we've been product oriented, not sales. There have been the practical problems of time and the multiple constituencies. There has continued the problem of all the scholastics being given their apprenticeship in teaching only in the high schools because these institutions don't have the funds to hire laymen. So a great number of young Jesuits put their foot for the first time into the "inside" of a Jesuit university to begin the process of understanding its workings at 32 or 35 years of age. Is ignorance to be wondered at?

But Jesuit College people have been remiss. We must do far better.

In conclusion, I respect the right of Father Sanders and the disaffected he may speak for to hold their view. We must all be profoundly critical which means judgmental, which means evaluating the real, *all* of it as it is. The *criteria* and the *data* are very important. If these are poorly gone at then broadsides only do harm, confuse the innocent and discourage the faithful.

Our work involves ultimately still some faith, lots of it, that leaps from a hunch to an acceptance.

The Vision of Christ and Christian Freedom

PATRICK H. RATTERMAN, S.J.

INTRODUCTION

Catholic universities and colleges are currently undergoing dramatic changes. The most recent and perhaps the most startling development has been the truly revolutionary transfer of both ownership and governance responsibilities at some Catholic schools to boards of trustees which include, and in some cases are dominated by, laymen. Less conspicuous, but of far greater ultimate significance, has been the trend toward a greater freedom and increased community responsibility on the part of lay faculty and students on Catholic campuses. Philip Gleason traces the evolution which is presently occurring in Catholic higher education to social, institutional and intellectual shifts which are occurring in American society and in the larger national academe. Gleason further feels that this evolution is solidifying around the single, basic issue of academic freedom as it pertains to both faculty and students.¹

Considerations of academic freedom with respect to faculty and students seem logically inseparable. At the present moment the demands of student academic freedom in all universities and colleges are receiving a greater public attention. Historically, however, academic freedom for faculty precedes consideration of student academic freedoms. Claims for academic freedom for both faculty and students have the same ultimate bases: respect for freedom of conscience, respect for the dignity of the individual, and respect for the respective goals of both faculty and students in the unique circumstances of the university society. The teacher must be free not just to search for truth but to teach what he sincerely believes to be true; the student must be free to seek truth in all its valid sources. In the university society dialogue and rational argument must be respected as important means to attain truth for both teacher and student. Hence freedom to speak and freedom to hear become basic rights for both student and teacher within the framework of academic freedom. These are the fundamental assertions of academic freedom in the university society as they pertain to both faculty and students.

¹ Gleason, Philip, "The Crisis in Catholic Universities: An Historical Perspective," *Catholic Mind*, September, 1966, pp. 43-45.

Beyond the considerations mentioned above, the term academic freedom has become something of a shibboleth in the university society. It is applied, especially by students, to almost any and every cause they feel appropriate to urge. Residence hall non-regulation, involvement in civil issues, obscenities on campus posters (but not on rest room walls), intramural and Varsity sports programs and even provision for student campus parking are all at times considered as falling somehow within the province of academic freedom. Any felt right or freedom which pertains to the students' position in the academic community has become by extension an academic right or an academic freedom. The resulting semantic difficulties cause considerable confusion. In the present discussion the community approach is adopted. The expression "student rights and freedoms" is intended to include all rights and all freedoms, academic or non-academic, as they might apply to students as members of a university community.

In recent years there has been a disproportionate ferment on Catholic campuses with respect to student rights and freedoms.² There is no reason to suspect that this ferment will go away. Quite the contrary there is every reason to believe that student agitation on Catholic campuses will increase in the years ahead. A great deal of the student unrest on Catholic campuses has reference to conditions which are internal to the university. What are the internal issues for which students on Catholic campuses are agitating? Basically, Catholic university students today are impatient with the almost exclusively passive role previously assigned them in the Catholic concept of university education. John Tracy Ellis complains that Catholic colleges and universities have in the past been conducted "as though their main business was to serve as citadels for the preservation and protection of the faith, not as centers for cultivation of the intellect."³

Gleason points out that, "The whole thrust of the old system was in the direction of inculcating in its students a previously arrived at synthesis of secular knowledge, intellectual skills, ethical values and religious truths."⁴ Father Michael Walsh, President of Boston College, explains that, "When Catholic colleges were established in this country there was in them tremendous empha-

² Williamson, E. G., and Cowan, John L., *The American Student's Freedom of Expression*, The University of Minnesota Press, 1966, pp. 27-29.

³ Ellis, John Tracy, "Contemporary American Catholicism in the Light of History," *Critic*, June-July, 1966, p. 18.

⁴ Gleason, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

sis on spiritual and moral formation of youth, sometimes as the very meaning of the college. Colleges were regarded by many, including educators, as seminaries." (Father Walsh further explains that such views were by no means limited to Catholic colleges.)⁵

In quite healthy reaction to the "citadel," "seminary" "old system," Catholic students are agitating today to be allowed to play a more determinate role both in their own education and in the affairs of the university community. With a consistency that is not always appreciated they are challenging university rules and standards which continue as vestiges of educational goals that are coming to be regarded in a far different perspective. Students are agitating for rights and freedoms which they feel appropriate to a true university.

That Catholic universities and colleges will change in the years ahead, to a considerable extent precisely as a result of student ferment and agitation, is a presumption of this discussion. The only questions to be asked, it is felt, are how much Catholic universities will change, in what direction they will tend, how much turmoil will attend the changes, and where the process will end. The questions, taken in order, become increasingly difficult. How much will Catholic universities change? Change is, of course, a relative matter depending on the present situation at individual schools. It is perhaps safe to answer that in many cases the changes, however gradual, will be almost revolutionary. In what direction will the changes tend? Precisely in the direction the students have already determined, toward a greater student freedom which will include a more determining student participation in their own total educational experience. How much turmoil will attend the changes? Very little if the university provides active direction and leadership toward an ideal to which the entire Catholic university community can respond with intellectual integrity. Where will the process end? Rightly coordinated with other foreseeable developments on Catholic campuses the process can well terminate in an ideal of Catholic university education which will approximate significant important features proposed in Newman's "Idea of a University."

One other very important question must be asked. How will the emerging Catholic university and college be distinguished from other universities and colleges, particularly from non-sectarian,

⁵ Walsh, Michael P., "Where Church and World Meet," *Catholic Mind*, December, 1966, p. 46.

secular institutions? The Catholic university must, after all, be distinctive or it has no reason to exist. Moreover, it is essential that whatever distinguishes Catholic higher education must not frustrate the true university ideal. Ideally, that which distinguishes the Catholic university should provide a unique contribution to the more general academe in terms of two goals which are specific to the true university, truth and freedom. It shall be argued later in this discussion that the Catholic university can indeed fulfill this distinctive university mission, first, by communicating to its students the vision of Jesus Christ *as a source of truth*, and second, by presenting the Christian life emanating from Christ's message as *a rational basis for both intellectual and human freedom*. These two unique educational contributions are not only compatible with the educational mission of a true university, and therefore embrace the legitimate aspirations of students in the university society, but provide a basis upon which Catholic universities can develop an "idea of a university" which will make a substantial contribution to the overall goals of higher education.

PART I

THE CONTEXT OF STUDENT PROBLEMS ON THE CATHOLIC CAMPUS

Student views and attitudes on Catholic campuses cannot be understood without some comprehension of the context in which modern student problems are developing. Catholic students do not, should not, and cannot be made to, live in isolation. Their views and attitudes are strongly influenced by the situation which prevails in the larger academe. Students in Catholic universities are very much aware of the rights and freedoms allowed students in other universities. And even though in a very real sense they are disturbed by what they regard as abuses of these same freedoms, they frequently envy the rights and freedoms granted other students to make mistakes and learn by experience. While they are occasionally critical of the situation on other campuses, and perhaps unduly so, they perceive much that is good in the larger academic society. They seek to achieve a recognition of these same values on the Catholic campus. Prior, therefore, to any consideration of student rights and freedoms on the Catholic university campus, a serious effort must be made to understand and

evaluate the context in which Catholic university students perceive their problems. Three particular external influences are especially important to the consideration: student views of the Radical Left, the proposals of civil liberty societies for university governance, and the secular-humanist concept of academic freedom.

A. THE RADICAL LEFT

1. "The System"

In order to understand modern student views with respect to student academic rights and freedoms one must first comprehend the perspective in which the Radical Left, or New Left, views modern society. The Radical Left analysis of modern society does not fit the conventional social and political categories. In place of the usual liberal (left), center and conservative (right) positions into which we ordinarily, and all too easily, categorize political and social views, modern students see three very different groupings. To the left is, of course, the Radical Left itself. In the conventional center the student sees the modern liberal. At the right is "the system." "The system" encompasses any social, political or religious organization which is large, affluent, organized, technical, and above all, highly impersonal. Grouped together, therefore, on the right are such unlikely bedfellows as big government, big business, laissez-faire capitalism, Communism and organized religion. In the liberal camp the student places persons (usually over thirty) and groups that think radical (who say they want to change "the system") but who somehow have a stake in "the system" and so cannot really be trusted. At the radical left are those who are willing to risk all (or who have nothing to risk) for the social changes that are necessary to dethrone "the system." It is an interesting perspective and in many ways far more logical than the conventional construct.

Jacques Maritain expresses a very similar position. "The pure man of the right detests justice and charity, preferring hypothetically injustice to disorder."⁶ Father Charles Davis expressed the same thought when he stated upon leaving the Catholic Church, "There is concern for authority at the expense of truth and I am constantly saddened by instances of the damage done

⁶ Maritain, Jacques, "Maritain Charts A Course Through Change," (an interview by John Howard Griffin), *The National Catholic Reporter*, November 9, 1966.

to persons by the workings of an impersonal and unfree system.”⁷ Maritain and Davis express quite precisely the complaint of the Radical Left against “the system.” “The system,” says the Radical Left, cannot be reconciled with justice, charity, honesty, freedom and human dignity.

During the recent (November-December, 1966) disturbances on the Berkeley campus Chancellor Roger W. Heyns is quoted as saying that some of the agitators “are out to destroy” the university, “while others want to control it.”⁸ Chancellor Heyns is undoubtedly quite correct in his suspicion that some of the student agitators on the Berkeley campus really intend to destroy the university. It is a position of the Radical Left that any “system” which is beyond reform must be destroyed. There is little doubt that at least some Berkeley radicals consider the university so systematized and impersonal that it is beyond reform. The campus radical, it might be added, feels no responsibility to provide or even to suggest alternatives for “the system” he criticizes or seeks to destroy. “The system,” he reasons, is too entrenched for there to be any danger of its immediate fall. His function, as he sees it, is forcefully to expose non-answers.

Some of the documents of the Radical Left, notably those of SDS (Students for a Democratic Society), are liable to impress the uninitiated as a hoax of some kind. “(Students and faculty) must wrest control of the educational process from the administrative bureaucracy. They must make fraternal and functional contact with allies in labor, civil rights, and other liberal forces outside the campus.”⁹ It is a bit disconcerting for student personnel administrators to find students being urged by SDS to “hold mock trials for the Dean of Men and Dean of Women for their ‘crimes against humanity.’”¹⁰ It is a bit difficult to realize that such statements are seriously intended. They are.

2. *The University Society*

Where there is a possibility of reform the campus radicals and associated liberals have their own views for university reorganization. Some absolutely secure base for student rights and freedoms

⁷ “Davis Leaves the Church,” *The National Catholic Reporter*, January 4, 1967.

⁸ “Cooling It At Berkeley,” *Time*, December 16, 1966, p. 110.

⁹ “Port Huron Statement,” Founding Convention of Students for a Democratic Society, Port Huron, Michigan, June 11-15, 1962.

¹⁰ Davidson, Carl, S.D.S. National Vice-President, “Toward Student Syndicalism,” *New Left Notes*, September 9, 1966, p. 11.

must be provided. It is proposed, therefore, that the three traditional sectors of the university—students, faculty and administration—should each be completely autonomous, each absolutely independent, each with an ultimate right of free decision with respect to its own particular functions in the university society. Some procedures, it is allowed, must necessarily be provided for the adjudication of problems where functions of the respective sectors conflict. It is a bit difficult to reconcile the proposed three-autonomous-sector concept of the university society with the further student claim that “student affairs” embrace every aspect of university life. That would appear to leave very little to be adjudicated between the faculty and administration sectors.

Two quite opposite views are endorsed by various student groups of the Radical Left with respect to campus government. First, there is the view that the university is not distinct from civil society and should, therefore, be governed only by the rules and regulations of the larger society.

The university is simply a part of a larger political entity. Its campus is an extension of the city streets. Its central mall is the university’s Hyde Park. The city ordinances set its standards of conduct, or the permissible. The important fact about the student is that he is a citizen. The rights of all members of the university are most clearly and definitively spelled out in the U. S. Constitution. The rules that govern a student are those of a citizen in court. The university is essentially a town meeting, each citizen having one vote.¹¹

The quite opposite view, that the university should not be considered responsible to civil authority, is supported by probably a greater number of the Radical Left. These would hold that the university should be regarded as something unique, inviolate and sacred, not to be interfered with by civil society in its conduct of university affairs. This view is reflected in the first of the recent five demands made by student strikers at Berkeley University,

That policemen never be called onto campus to “solve” campus political problems. (Such action is entirely inappropriate in an academic community, dedicated to rational and aware problem-solving.)¹²

¹¹ Heyns, Roger, “Extremes of Action Are Polarizing Our Campuses,” *College and University Business*, January, 1967, p. 46.

¹² *Commonweal*, editorial, “As Berkeley Awaits Ronald Reagan,” January 27, 1967, p. 443.

There are several interesting corollaries to the three-autonomous-sector theory of university government. The proposal cannot be taken seriously, quite obviously, unless the student sector is accepted as equal with the faculty and administration sectors. It is obvious too that equal status cannot be claimed by students unless the traditional concept of student is somehow changed. The position of a "student" is, after all, by nature inferior to that of "teacher" in the traditional university concept. Such an inferior position cannot be reconciled with the equal sector theory. The university cannot, therefore, be broken into student, teacher categories. It can only be conceived as a "community of scholars," students and faculty being equals as "scholars" (with administration reduced to mere functionaries who provide the necessary educational accommodations.)

For obvious reasons the stand for equality among university sectors has difficulty allowing for any degree of immaturity on the part of students or particular student groups. The November front cover of *Moderator*, a moderately Radical Left student magazine, caricatured any such consideration as "America's Baby Policy." Regardless of what psychologists and sociologists say, the seventeen year old entering college must be regarded and respected as fully mature and treated as such, an equal among equals in the university society.

The three-autonomous-sector concept of university society, conceived as a means to guarantee student freedoms, is unquestionably to some extent an outcome of legitimate student frustration. USNSA officers explain three phases in their recent efforts to attain student rights and freedoms.¹³ During the fifties USNSA's efforts centered on a recognition of student rights, and this they feel they have reasonably achieved. At least the existence of student rights is today generally recognized. As a move toward the implementation of these rights USNSA, during the first half of the 60's, strove for student representation on important university committees and boards. This move met with partial success. It revealed, however, a student weakness in that student delegates were frequently persuaded in meetings to accept positions which could not be reconciled with ideals for student rights and freedoms currently being advocated by USNSA.

¹³ AAUP, Committee S, consultation on proposed Statement on Student Academic Freedom, Washington, D.C., November 13-14, 1966.

USNSA, therefore, is now entering a third phase for influencing the university society to student views, a phase where "program" is being stressed, the purpose being to see that student delegates who are accepted as equals on university committees are properly instructed to USNSA views. The USNSA three-phase plan, as outlined above, is both responsible and appropriate to university procedures.

One cannot but wonder, however, how frustrations might express themselves if the third phase fails to bring the changes in the university society which USNSA currently proposes. Is a fourth phase, "Student Power!" to be expected? Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., wrote from the Birmingham jail:

We have not made a single gain in civil rights without determined legal and nonviolent pressure. . . . We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed.

The student rights movement has learned too much from its participation in the civil rights cause to be ignorant of Dr. King's experience. The question is not whether student power will become a factor in the university argument. It already has. An evolving problem for USNSA and other responsible student groups is not just to restrain student power to "legal and non-violent pressure" but especially to restrict it in such a manner that it will not destroy the possibility of reasonable disagreement and rational argument in the university society. One is horrified at the reception given to Secretary McNamara last November (1966) when he was effectively silenced on the Harvard campus. This was certainly an exercise of student power run amuck. Student power, it would appear, can no more be reconciled with "rational and aware problem-solving" than police power. There is a further even more serious problem to which student power gives rise.

The tool which blocks the path to the mere Navy recruiter in Berkeley and to the mere President at the University of Chicago can block the path to the classroom door if the teacher—like the recruiter and the administrator—in the performance of his function happens to teach what a few militant students don't want taught.¹⁴

¹⁴ Stahr, Elvis J., Jr. (President of Indiana University), Indiana University News Bureau release, February 6, 1967.

3. *Lack of Trust*

Students speak a great deal today about the distrust with which they regard modern education. "So much of what you teach us is unreal or irrelevant," they claim. "The world we find beyond the campus is just not the world you tell us about. It doesn't fit into your neat categories and pigeon holes." "People outside are being ignored, lost and hurt every day by 'the system.'" Education itself, the radical student feels, has become a servant to "the system." Worse, education has itself become just one more highly technical, increasingly impersonal, huge "system" where people are ignored, lost and hurt. Teachers, especially those over thirty, are beyond hope since they have a stake in "the system." And so in frustration young radicals in some areas have turned to creating their own free universities where courses are relevant and teachers are truly free.

The student lack of trust carries into every phase of university life. Grading is a particularly vulnerable area. Really significant educational achievement, it is maintained, cannot be measured objectively; and subjective evaluation is liable to error because of personality factors. All grading, therefore, must be abandoned. Course hours, quality points and degree honors likewise provide inadequate measures for true academic achievement. They are but a form of tyranny in the educational "system." Modern education, as presently structured, simply cannot be trusted.

This same attitude of distrust carries, of course, into the area of university discipline. The Radical Left advocates a university hands-off-student-private-life policy, the university restricting the exercise of its authority solely to the academic sphere. Any further extension of university authority is an "invasion of privacy." The Radical Left argues that students are, after all, citizens and are therefore entitled to all the rights of other citizens. The university has no right to add restrictions by insisting upon special university behavioral standards. Since faculty and administration cannot be trusted to restrain the exercise of university authority to strict university purposes students feel they have no responsibility to obey any rule which they themselves have not approved.

4. *Appraisal*

Students of the Radical Left represent the angry young men in our American society. They stir "the system" from complacency

and keep the liberal honest. The radical students of our present generation may not actually have read Orwell's *1984* or Huxley's *Brave New World*, but they sense the threat that size and computer know-how constitute to human dignity and freedom. They have observed firsthand in their civil rights experiences society's warped conscience tranquilized and safekept by custom and convention. They have heard "authority" and "respect for law" extolled while being used to protect injustice and even inhumanity. The Radical Left is upset and disturbed.

Campus radicals and their liberal associates hope for "a brave new world" of their own where acceptable human behavior will not be measured to the last petty detail by conformity to rules and conventions, but where human dignity, justice, integrity and love will be the mark of respect for freer men. To anybody over thirty and, it might be suspected, to many younger people as well, this is literally a frightening ideal. Earlier generations were "brought up" in a world where a young man's success was achieved when he found "his place" in society. Society was always the accepted constant. There were rules and conventions to keep it constant. It was always there. Young radicals resent not only being expected to find "their place" but they reject modern society itself as they find it. Their ultimate goal is to form a new society where there will be no preconceived or prearranged "places." Right now, in the university community, they insist that they be allowed to play a determinate role in their own preparation for the new society. Their efforts to assume mature responsibility in the university community meet, they feel, with constant rebuff. Their frustration partially explains their present insistence that they be allowed to form and control their own autonomous sector in the university community.

For a variety of social and economic reasons there are very few full-fledged members of the Radical Left on Catholic university campuses. A fair share of Radical Left ideas, however, find their way into Catholic university communities, imported and promoted by the more activist, and frequently more intelligent, students who feel they have a role to play in the formation of the evolving new society. Their ideas are not altogether incompatible with some of the views expressed in the documents of the Second Vatican Council.

The living conditions of modern man have been so profoundly changed in their social and cultural dimensions, that we can speak of a new age in human history.¹⁵

The not infrequent response is to complain that student activities have lost all respect for authority. Or it might be pointed out to activist students that in the full spirit of Vatican II students should not express their minds until "they enjoy competence."¹⁶

But can the matter be judged so simply in the university society? Is "competence" a reasonable norm for student campus expression? Is not the campus argument, where competing ideas are frequently expressed with more bravery than wisdom, the precise forum in which it is intended that students will grow in maturity and competence? Where else are young Catholics to gain the competence, so soon to be expected of them, to play a responsible role in the formation of the "new age in human history?" If personal meekness and campus serenity are to be supreme goals on the Catholic university campus, where are students to "grow" in their ability "to wonder, to understand, to contemplate, to make personal judgments, and to develop a religious, moral and social sense?"¹⁷

Would it not be more honest to say that campus activists have a legitimate role to play if they do no more than prick the conscience of educational and social complacency on the Catholic university campus? Perhaps the campus ferment the activists cause helps solve another quite different and far more serious problem which the entire Catholic university community should be probing. Why are so many students in Catholic universities so complacently unconcerned about the societal problems that surround them, including problems in the university society itself? Is an unquestioning, unprobing mind the university ideal at any time, but especially on a Catholic campus during a period when "a new age in human history" is in formation?

B. CIVIL LIBERTIES INFLUENCE

The second external influence which is important to an understanding of student views has its source in the proposals of civil liberties societies for the proper governance of the university.

¹⁵ *The Documents of Vatican II*, Walter M. Abbott, S.J. (general editor), Herder and Herder, Association Press, New York, 1966, "Constitution on the Church in the Modern World," #54.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, #62.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, #59.

In 1964 Dr. Joseph F. Kauffman, presently Dean of Students on the University of Wisconsin Madison campus, made the following observation.

When students, supported by civil liberties groups, demand precise definitions of relationships, responsibilities, obligations, and expectations, it seems evident that the student-teacher relationship is sorely tried—the *educational relationship ruptured*—and the governance of the institution defensive and harassed.¹⁸

The demands for precise definitions of university relationships are cited by Dr. Kauffman merely as evidence of a “sorely tried,” “ruptured” educational student-teacher relationship. Might not a further question reasonably be asked? Is it not possible that the demand for precise definitions and procedures in the university society, so strongly supported by civil liberty societies, serves not merely as evidence but as a contributing cause to campus misunderstanding? One might well wonder, for example, whether a great deal of the prevailing student distrust is not generated by an insistence on procedures which force the university to act as though neither the university nor the student can be trusted. Manifest fairness and adequate protective procedures, it might be observed, are essential to establishing and maintaining an essential mutual confidence. Excessive legalism, however, will destroy it. It is possible that civil liberty societies, all in the cause of fair play and justice on the university campus, have become so concerned with the letter of the law that they are helping to destroy its spirit?

Is there the further possibility—and the question is asked most seriously—that the modern student freedoms movement is not benefiting by the best and most progressive civil liberties thinking?

Anyone familiar with the present day campus situation cannot but be impressed, for instance, with the relevance of the thinking of Carl J. Friedrich. In an article entitled, “Rights, Liberties, Freedoms: A Reappraisal,” Friedrich traces the history of the civil liberties movement from its inception during the French Revolution to present times. In his historical sketch Dr. Friedrich distinguishes between the older civil rights of independence and

¹⁸ Kauffman, Joseph F., “Student Personnel Services: Some Questions and Recommendations,” reprinted in *The Educational Record*, ACE, Fall, 1964. Originally, “A Report to the Commission on Academic Affairs of the American Council on Education.”

participation and a new third class of civil rights (and freedoms) which have been made possible only by recent developments in modern society. This third class, which he terms "rights of creation," includes "the right to social security, work, rest and leisure, education, adequate standard of living, participation in cultural life, and even to an international order securing these rights." Because of the possibility in our day of implementing these new rights for the first time in human history Friedrich speaks of the abandonment of the "state of nature," "Robinson Crusoe," "isolation" concept of freedom which has dominated civil liberties thinking for so long. He speaks of a new civil liberties ideal which he terms "effective interdependence." Effectively interdependent freedom in modern society, according to Friedrich

is to be free to share AND THE SPHERE OF INDEPENDENCE IS NOT PRIMARY, BUT A COROLLARY OF PARTICIPATION IN THE COMMUNITY AND OF CONTRIBUTION TO IT THROUGH ONE'S CREATIVITY. (Emphasis added.)

As Friedrich explains, "although independence still dominates the civil liberties oratory," there has been "A PROFOUND SHIFT OF OUTLOOK AND EMPHASIS" within the movement.¹⁹

One does not find any such "profound shift of outlook and emphasis" in the civil liberties thinking which is influencing the modern student academic freedom movement. Student radicals and activists appear inspired by the more antiquated civil liberties ideals which apparently are no longer applicable even in civil society let alone in the unique circumstance of the university community. The ideal of "sharing" through "effective interdependence" and the concept of freedom where "the sphere of independence is not primary" are strangely unfamiliar to the campus argument. Perhaps the truly significant contribution to the student academic freedom movement by civil liberties groups is yet to be made.

C. SECULAR HUMANISM

The concept of academic freedom proposed by Jefferson and strongly supported by the secular-humanist forces which presently dominate modern education exercises a strong influence over stu-

¹⁹ Friedrich, Carl J., "Rights, Liberties, Freedoms: A Reappraisal." *The American Political Science Review*, December, 1963, Vol. LVII, No. 4, pp. 841-854.

dents on Catholic university campuses. It is a singularly engaging concept flattering man in his highest power, his intellect. It bears the typical American trait of unlimited optimism. Truth will overcome error. Good will overcome evil, Virtue will ultimately triumph.

Inscribed in gold letters circling the dome of the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, D.C., one reads the famous words,

I have sworn before the altar of the eternal God to fight against every form of tyranny over the minds of men.

A more specific expression of the secular-humanist ideal of academic freedom can be found in a letter written by Jefferson to prospective faculty members for the University of Virginia.

This institution will be based on the illimitable freedom of the human mind. For here we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate error so long as reason is free to combat it.²⁰

Freedom to search for truth wherever it is to be found; freedom to follow truth wherever it may lead; complete confidence that in the university argument truth will overcome error—these are the basic elements of academic freedom proposed by Thomas Jefferson which are widely endorsed today in the secular academe.

In any consideration of the effect the Jeffersonian academic ideal has had upon the modern student movement, it is very important to note that rationalism has undergone a considerable change from Jefferson's day to our own. Jefferson assumed that there was such a thing as objective truth, and that the human mind had the capacity to recognize and grasp this truth. When Jefferson stated that he had no fear of error so long as reason was free to combat it he expressed an obvious belief that truth was one thing, error quite another, and that between the two there was an objective difference which the human mind could definitely perceive. Today, ironically, secular humanism endorses a most "un-Jeffersonian" lack of faith in the capacity of the human mind to perceive an objective difference between truth and error. Historically the development is not difficult to trace. Since Jefferson's day the areas in which reason has been considered competent to perceive truth (and refute error) have become increasingly restricted. In the 19th century the empirical philosophers restricted reason to the function of

²⁰ Barth, Alan, "The Loyalty of Free Men," Viking, 1951, p. 203.

accumulating and codifying into laws the facts of experience. At the turn of the century pragmatism further restricted the function of the human mind to judging only that which experience demonstrated to obtain practical and meaningful results. And with the modern dominance of scientism the capacity of reason to perceive truth is all but forsaken, for today's scientific truth is certainly vulnerable to tomorrow's scientific finding. And so from Jefferson's absolute faith in reason as a source of objective truth the modern secular humanist has come effectively to deny reason as a source of any truth. From Jefferson's belief in objective truth the humanist has turned to "subjective truth." The university world today is that of the secular city, an agnostic world, a world which in a very real sense completely denies Jefferson's faith that reason can perceive truth and refute error.

Modern student thinking with respect to student rights and freedoms in the university society—and this thinking very frequently finds its way onto Catholic campuses—all too obviously reflects the prevailing secular-humanist agnosticism. What meaning has the "pursuit of truth" in a university society which does not believe that truth can really ever be achieved? What truths are "relevant" in a university world which effectively denies the possibility of wisdom? Teaching in such a society becomes a mockery, the imposition of one man's opinion upon another, the very sort of tyranny over the minds of men that Jefferson so strongly condemned. In such an educational milieu compulsion in any form is not only an offense against freedom but a violation of human dignity. The Jeffersonian formula for campus argument is preserved not only as an intellectual sophistication or campus rite which lacks Jefferson's firm conviction that truth would prevail over error. What remains in such a society to determine truth? Power, not truth, must overcome error. Power alone can assure freedom. It is interesting to note that the student academic freedom movement is evolving in precisely this direction.

There is a further, far more devastating effect which secular humanism sometimes has upon Catholic students. The secular-humanist concept of academic freedom is based on the assumptions of rationalist agnosticism: the *sole* source of truth is human reason; human reason cannot perceive truth with any degree of certainty; in final analysis the human mind cannot distinguish between truth and error. The Catholic university, quite obviously, cannot ac-

commodate itself to such assumptions. Students in Catholic universities, as a consequence, are liable to seek an apologetic and all too simple accommodation with "the true and full academic freedom." University commitment becomes an embarrassment to be explained, where possible, as university emphasis. Further, the apology and accommodation sometimes carries over from the Catholic university to religious faith itself. Religious faith becomes something not quite respectable in true academe.

Academic life has become so much more complicated than in the old days when the Catholic "citadel" response to secular humanism would have been one of disdain accompanied by strong efforts to isolate students on Catholic campuses from such obviously pernicious and heretical views. The Deism of Jefferson would have been reason enough totally to discredit any educational philosophy he might have proposed. Each new Berkeley would have been hailed in Catholic university circles as a well deserved consequence of such Godless views. Every effort would have been made to avoid public knowledge of related, and therefore scandalous, unrest on the Catholic campus. Ecumenism, however, is the order of the day and it might well be argued that common misery remains the strongest ecumenical force to appear among men. Neither Catholic nor secular educators have a monopoly on problems of student rights and freedoms. Common discomfort is bringing all educators to an understanding dialogue with respect to student problems. The propriety, however, of Thomas Jefferson's serving as patron for an ecumenical approach to these problems might well be questioned by students. Jefferson's own record in student affairs as the first president of the University of Virginia reads like the modern student freedom movement writ backwards.²¹

The forthcoming dialogue between Catholic and secular educators on student rights and freedoms should prove fascinating. How interesting it would be if the Catholic educators were to take the position that Catholic universities are able to adapt to educational advantage more of the Jeffersonian ideal than secular universities are able comfortably to absorb. In a pluralistic society where educational diversity is a respected ideal, competing experience might well demonstrate that the Catholic university religious commitment, far from constituting a "tyranny over the minds of men," provides an intellectually liberating force in the academic com-

²¹ Cf. Honeywell, Roy J., *The Educational Work of Thomas Jefferson*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931, Chapter IX, "University Government."

munity. The Catholic university might argue that it offers the possibility for a more comprehensive search for truth than the university "committed to non-commitment" can conscientiously allow, a more academically meaningful freedom than the secular university can consistently endorse, and a premise for distinguishing truth from error academically more sound than the secular university can comfortably provide. How strange it would be if the Jefferson memorial in Washington one day became a focus of Catholic academic pilgrimage proscribed by secular-humanist academe. Meanwhile, in the agonies shared by all university educators over student agitations, it shall remain a shrine to academic ecumenism.

As a conclusion to Part I, the words of Pope John XXIII at the opening of the Second Vatican Council are, perhaps, not altogether inappropriate. They will undoubtedly suggest different considerations to various educators.

In the daily exercise of our pastoral office, we sometimes have to listen, much to our regret, to voices of persons who, though burning with zeal, are not endowed with too much sense of discretion or measure. In these modern times they can see nothing but prevarication and ruin. They say that our era, in comparison with past eras, is getting worse, and they behave as though they had learned nothing from history, which is, none the less, the teacher of life. They behave as though at the time of former Councils everything was a full triumph for the Christian idea and life and for proper religious liberty.

We feel we must disagree with those prophets of gloom, who are always forecasting disaster, as though the end of the world were at hand.

In the present order of things, Divine Providence is leading us to a new order of human relations which, by men's own efforts and even beyond their very expectations, are directed toward the fulfillment of God's superior and inscrutable designs. And everything, even human differences, leads to the greater good of the Church.²²

²² Abbott, "Pope John's Opening Speech to the Council," pp. 712-713.

The American Jesuit and Commitment To International Education

JOHN E. BLEWETT, S.J.

A 20th-century Ecclesiastes, surveying the sweep of American education, could well be forgiven the observation "Of making meetings there is no end." Thanks to the jet plane, members of the academic community can speak their articles and future books at meetings in professional societies in a way that puts one in mind of the golden years of Athens when to speak was to be a man and to speak persuasively a great man. The mounting interest of the American Jesuit community in what for want of a better term is here shorthanded as "international education" is attested to by three meetings held during the past fourteen months.¹ My purpose in this article is to report on some of the highlights of these meetings, then to outline in broad sweep a few of the developments in international education during the past 25 years, and finally to conclude with some personal observations on the American segment of the Society of Jesus and the role it can and should play in educating its members and various publics for life in a polycultural world.

The three meetings I refer to were the following: a) that of superiors of those Jesuit missions in which American Jesuits are active; in Syracuse in late January, 1966; b) that of American Jesuit provincials, some Jesuit university presidents, and a few Rome-based Jesuits in the presence of Very Reverend Father General; in Rome in October; c) that of representatives of Jesuit college and university presidents for matters relating to international education; in Chicago, in mid-March, 1967.

Meetings on International Education

At the Syracuse meeting a score of superiors discussed their problems with the American provincials, directors of mission of-

¹ The term "international education" hardly admits of precise definition. The dean of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University, Mr. Stephen Bailey, gathers under it the following activities: a) teaching of the non-American substance in school and university curricula in this country; b) education here for students from foreign countries; c) activities of American students and teachers abroad; d) educational assistance to developing nations by citizens of developed nations; e) all efforts made to lessen the ignorance of adult citizens concerning international and intercultural affairs. See his "International Education: Shadow and Substance" reprinted in *International Education: Past, Present, Problems and Prospects: Selected Readings* to supplement H.R. 14643 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966), pp. 1-7.

fices, spokesmen for the Jesuit university world, and a few other invited participants. Although the overseas operations of American Jesuits are not limited to education, almost all of the questions under discussion—the preparation of Jesuits for work in other countries, the relationships between American Jesuit universities and Jesuit work abroad, the role of the laity in this work, organization for more effective support and interpretation of overseas operations to constituencies at home, problems of finance—were connected with the American Jesuit educational enterprise in this country. One major question—that of the relationships between Jesuit universities in this country and those in the emerging nations—was discussed in plenary session on two occasions, perhaps in part because it provided a focus for observations on the commitment of our institutions to international education.²

There seemed to be general recognition of the fact that today's scholastics should have more opportunities to prepare themselves for a polycultural world; specifically, that their work in the social sciences and humanities should include components on one or more of the great Oriental cultures and on some of the problems racking the developing nations of the southern half of the planet. The advantages of increasing and enduring contact between representatives of Jesuit universities in Asia and Latin America (there are none in Africa) with those in the United States were recognized. The success of Saint Louis University in its assistance program to the Catholic University of Quito was referred to several times, and elicited the remark from its president that no single program had opened the windows of his institution to the outside world as had this one. Reference to the dynamic leadership of the Academic Vice-President, Father Robert Henle, in planning this program and even nursing it through to fruition, drew the comment from one of the university participants that the success of institutional involvement in an overseas program depends heavily on this type of administrative concern. Without it, faculty interest or student involvement will too often bubble down the stream of good but unrealized intentions.

In the second of the three meetings briefly reviewed here, the American provincials, four present or past university presidents acting as delegates to the General Congregation—Fathers William

² For a summary of the discussion see *Proceedings of the Jesuit Mission Superiors' Meeting*, January 25-28, 1966 (edited by J. P. Cotter, S.J. and M. M. Morton, distributed by Jesuit Missions, Inc., New York City), pp. 37-44.

Crandell, John Leary, Paul O'Connor, and Paul Reinert—Father Phil Land of the Institute of Social Sciences of the Gregorian University, and Father Blewett from the Curia had the opportunity of hearing Very Reverend Father General outline his hopes for more cooperation among various parts of the Jesuit network. In rapid succession he reviewed some of the considerations that he and other decision-makers must hold in mind as they evaluate Jesuit activity: the directive of Pope Paul VI to the Society to concern itself with the fact of atheism in its variant forms across the planet; the plans (recently carried out) to organize a Secretariat within the Vatican on World Justice and Peace; the efforts of UNESCO and UN to mobilize world public opinion to aid the emerging nations in the "Development Decade" of the sixties; the expanding web of relationships between American universities and their counterparts in Asia, Africa, and Latin America; the launching of Peace Corps programs in several of the technologically advanced nations; the contribution of radio and television to mankind's heightened awareness of the interdependence of all.

Father General praised the work of the American Jesuits in their own country and abroad to promote understanding and cooperation across national boundaries but indicated clearly that he judged that much more could be accomplished.

As an initial response to his request that American Jesuits review their work in the light of mounting world need, the presidents of the universities appointed representatives for international education from each of their institutions and empowered them to meet at their earliest convenience to exchange information and to work towards improving present, or initiating new programs. In a work-packed session of one day Fathers Blewett and Henle reported and led discussions on "Jesuit Commitment to International Education" and "International Programs in Action," while Father William Kelley commented on some of the salient features of his background study "Involvement in International Education of American Jesuit Higher Education" and Father James Collins of the Xavier Labour Relations Institute of Jamshedpur, India illustrated, through reference to his own institution, how a cooperative program can develop.³ Doctor Rocco Porreco, of Georgetown University, presented an impressive inventory of the manifold

³ The Kelley Report was published by the central office of the JEA in February, 1967, and copies circulated to all Jesuit universities as well as to interested individuals.

activities of his institution in international education and concluded with some recommendations on cooperation. Father Paul Harney of the University of San Francisco, which enrolls a larger percent of foreign students than any other Jesuit institution (the absolute number leaped from 264 to 575 between 1964-65 and 1966-67), explained that its geographic position, rather than any directed campaign, seems to account for this rapid increase. The fact that USF has two full-time foreign student advisors and began in 1964 a program in intensive English for foreign students has undoubtedly contributed to this remarkable growth. Fordham's representative, Mr. Socas of the Political Science Department, reported that in an effort to understand what more it might do in international education, Fordham had sought the advisory services of officers of Education and World Affairs, the influential promoter of many of the best developments in this field in recent years. The evaluation indicated that Fordham was using less than 50 per cent of its actual resources in faculty and students qualified for teaching or leading international activities.

The recommendation of the institutional representatives looked toward a permanent structure within each college or university and within the Jesuit Educational Association to foster, promote, and evaluate programs in international education. Cooperation with other institutions, both at home and abroad, was urged, and the value of a directory of Jesuit educational institutions in other parts of the world was underlined.

Growth of American Interest in International Education

That Jesuits and institutions in which they are active are alive to the expanding world of international education is not surprising. Not only are they committed to an understanding of the good of the human family that carries their vision beyond national boundaries; they are also part of and play a role in an American educational world which more and more sees itself as related to the most distant shores. It was not always true, however, that American educational institutions were open to the immensities of a polycultural world, especially one which would include Asia, Africa, and Latin America. What public leader would dare today to decry an American's being educated in India the way Thomas Jef-

person described the malformation he feared would result from a European education? An American student, he stated

acquires a fondness for European luxury and dissipation, and a contempt for the simplicity of his own country; he is fascinated with the privileges of the European aristocrats, and sees, with abhorrence, the lovely equality which the poor enjoy with the rich, in his own country; he contracts a partiality for aristocracy or monarchy; he forms foreign friendships which will never be useful to him, and loses the seasons of life for forming, in his own country, those friendships which, of all others, are the most faithful and permanent . . . It appears to me, then, that an American, coming to Europe for education, loses in his knowledge, in his morals, in his health, and in his happiness.⁴

Thirty years ago the faculty of a land grant institution could hardly see beyond the waving wheat or bending corn of its surroundings; today they fan out across the globe on projects of assistance ranging from a land reform program in Peru to teacher education efforts in Nigeria. Fear of contamination from foreigners has largely given way to desire to learn their languages, their attitudes, their culture.

What are some of the reasons that account for the proliferation of Luso-Brazilian Institutes or Centers for Buddhist Studies or junior-year-abroad programs from one end of the country to another?

The bombs that rained down on Pearl Harbor tore apart more than the buildings and ships they exploded on. They shattered the American illusion that the ocean moats of the Atlantic and Pacific could protect the country from what lay beyond. The soothing voice of Tokyo Rose calling to American soldiers to lay down their arms; the frictions between Chiang Kai-shek and American commanders on the conduct of the war in China and south-east Asia; the prospect that Gandhi would lead the Indian peoples to independence of Britain—these facts and events were part of that “beyond” of the early forties which America was largely ignorant of. As part of the war effort, some 65 centers were established between 1941 and 1945, for language and area training programs in universities,

⁴ Thomas Jefferson, “Objections to Sending American Students to Europe.” Letter from Paris to J. Bannister, quoted in Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., “Peace, Understanding, and Education” (National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin, *Peace and Understanding through Education*, edited by Mary Irwin, Vol. 62, No. 1, August, 1965), pp. 31-32.

most of which included instruction in non-Western languages and affairs.⁵ Whether war is the whip that drives man to new types of ingenuity can be left to social philosophers to debate. It is indisputable that it was the engine that carried non-Western studies to dozens of campuses.

Decades before 1941 an annual trickle of American talent was already finding its way to a score of campuses from remote parts of China, India, Japan, and the Near East—the children of Protestant missionaries. Often speaking one of the “exotic” languages and aware that the great world of Asia was the scene of action of their parents and friends, they helped to irrigate the enclosed fields they flowed into with some understanding of peoples and cultures old when Columbus discovered America. Although Protestant mission concern “had relatively little effect on the curriculum and almost none on the scholarship of the period [the 19th century], it sowed the seeds of a hybrid growth of moral awareness and intellectual interest which came to fruition in the twentieth century. It is no accident that many of the colleges now embarking on non-Western studies trace their original motives to missionary involvement in various parts of the world.”⁶

If the needs spawned by war and the motivation nourished by missionary concern were instrumental in a gradually swelling upsurge of interest in non-Western studies, it was the foundations that, after the war, provided the financial support for further growth. The combined efforts of the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations enabled struggling directors of non-Western area studies programs to carry on in the immediate postwar years, while massive assistance from the Ford Foundation from 1951 on and from the government after the passage in 1958 of the National Defense Education Act have made it possible for language and area centers to expand at major universities, and at smaller colleges for a large variety of programs to be initiated and sustained.

The importance of the international dimension in American education cannot be measured in dollars and cents. The fact that the most significant federal move ever made in the field of inter-

⁵ Kenneth W. Mildener, “The Federal Government and the Universities,” reprinted in *International Education: Past, Present, Problems and Prospects*, p. 23. Since my discussion of international education largely concerns its “non-Western” aspects, I would like to explain that my use of this inexact, unlovely, but widely accepted term sees it as referring to Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Like “non-Catholic,” it is unlovely; like “non-colored” it is inexact. A more courageous soul should popularize “non-Euro-North American.”

⁶ *Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College: A Report of the Commission on International Understanding* (Washington, D.C.; Association of American Colleges, 1964), p. 20.

national education—the International Education Act of 1966—provided for only a small appropriation for the first fiscal year disappointed many. Since this sum, however, was earmarked for officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to prepare studies justifying much larger appropriations in the future, it is clear that the government wishes to promote international education on a vaster scale than ever before.⁷

Jesuits and International Education—The Recent Past

If the overall performance of Jesuit universities since 1945 in international education is looked at closely, there is room for little complacency. That such a scrutiny is now in place would seem to be clear if for no other reason than the implications of the International Education Act, which is designed to “provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research” both on the graduate and undergraduate levels. As each institution studies its own performance and projects plans for the future, either individually or in union with other universities and colleges, the excesses of self-flagellation for past deficiencies and of panting lust to be “contemporary” should be avoided. The following observations may be of assistance to administrators, professors, and students as they study more closely the Jesuit educational enterprise in relation to international education.

If we turn to one set of criteria to judge how much has been done, the tendency to self-reproach may be strengthened. Among the recipients of \$206 million disbursed by the Ford Foundation to 135 liberal-arts colleges, 24 universities and 44 foreign-area programs up to January, 1966, only one Jesuit institution was included: Loyola University of Chicago for studies in Comparative Law. One looks in vain for a representative from a Jesuit university or college on any of the committees of the important center of Education and World Affairs. On the 12-member committee on AID and the University, established in late September, 1965, no Jesuit representative can be found. At the same date only one Jesuit institution was included among the 70 which were carrying on, in association with AID (The Agency for International Development), 143 university-to-university projects in 39 countries, at a cost of al-

⁷ The text of the International Education Act of 1966, with helpful commentaries, can be found in the booklet, *International Education Act of 1966*, published by Education and World Affairs, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York.

most \$180 million. In late 1966 the situation had improved only to the extent that the same institution, St. Louis University, had taken on a second project, in the Dominican Republic, as an extension of its solid work in Ecuador. No Jesuit institution can be identified as strong in any aspect of Asian or African studies, while perhaps only one would be included by scholars of Latin American affairs as demonstrably strong and provocatively planning in that area. When, finally, in October, 1966, a sampling of the best articles on international education was published by the House Committee on Education and Labor in connection with the bill on the subject, none from a faculty member of a Jesuit institution was included.

The past is prologue to the future, but not in the sense that it dictates tomorrow's decisions. Rather, it adumbrates alternatives among which conscious choice must be made. If at first sight the record of Jesuit institutions in international education has been unimpressive, decision-makers have the option to be undiscouraged and to set out vigorously on new paths. Before, however, we conclude that little has been accomplished, as measured by the criteria listed above, it would be well to probe more deeply and seek the reasons for the fact.

If Mills, Goucher, Mount Holyoke, Amherst, Oberlin, Yale, and Harvard—to list a few obvious examples—were brought into touch with the worlds of Asia in the nineteenth century, it was largely through returning missionaries or their children. The fact that almost no American Jesuits were working outside the confines of this country until the first decades of this century; the fact that celibate consecration precluded a flow of bi-lingual children of Catholic missionaries to American campuses; the fact, finally, that American Jesuit missionaries, unlike their Protestant confreres, were expected *not* to return home:—these are some of the considerations that help to explain the little interest of Fordham or Xavier or Santa Clara in non-Western cultures until only recently.

When the demands of the Pacific War drove harried military planners to seek the assistance of the universities, they naturally turned to institutions already identified as involved in international affairs, and only Georgetown among Jesuit institutions could qualify as such. Further, the heavy stress on religion, philosophy, and classical languages in the curriculum of the Jesuit institutions had limited the development of interest in the social sciences and modern languages, the type of knowledge, apart from the physical sciences, most closely linked to the successful waging of war in

Asia. Jesuit administrators, far from seeing their institutions being strengthened by addition of courses in Chinese, Japanese, Russian, anthropology, and political science, saw their staffs being weakened as dozens of physically fit Jesuits traded campus comforts for service chaplaincies.

In one notable way the Jesuit body of the United States was active in international education before the war and after—the development of institutions overseas. In British Honduras, the Philippines, Iraq, the northeast areas of India, and in China before the Pacific War, and in many developing countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa since, American Jesuits have opened every type of school from kindergarten to graduate, while direct financial assistance to Sophia University in Tokyo in the fifties helped that institution to startling growth. If today Jesuit high schools, colleges, and universities flourish wherever American Jesuits have worked, it is a tribute to the work of men who, long before the Peace Corps and development aid became household word, had thrown in their lot with the educable needy. Quite likely, this “brain drain” of promising American Jesuits to other countries weakened the power of home institutions to open out international dimensions in their curricula and other programs.

As a concrete instance of the way in which deployment of outstanding Jesuits in overseas work clipped promising possibilities at an American institution, one might consider the three men who shortly after the war were beginning an Institute on Oriental Studies at the University of San Francisco: Father Thomas Carroll, with a Ph.D. in Chinese Linguistics from Berkeley; Father Albert O'Hara, with a Ph.D. in Sociology from Catholic University; Father Gustav Voss, with an M.A. in Japanese History from Berkeley. The nascent Institute quickly starved when the first two were re-assigned to China, and Father Voss to Japan. The latter opened and still directs one of the outstanding high schools in Japan; Father O'Hara through more than a dozen years of teaching at the Taiwan National University has led thousands of young Chinese to an awareness of a multi-dimensional world, including themselves as created thrusts for the Infinite; Father Carroll, until an untimely death in Hong Kong in 1964, directed the patient efforts of a small group of lexicographers engaged in preparing a polyglot dictionary of Chinese. The seed that died in San Francisco yielded and yields harvest in Japan and Taiwan.

Jesuit institutions have been consistently generous in opening their doors to students from the non-Western world. Father Kelley's study reveals that in 1964-65, when the total number of foreign students in American colleges and universities stood at slightly more than 82,000, Jesuit institutions enrolled 2,700, more than three-quarters of whom came from non-Western countries.⁸ In their schools of Theology the American Jesuits have educated a not inconsiderable number of nationals from Latin America, the Philippines, and China, practically all of whom have returned to their countries, in marked contrast to the large percentage of professionals in other fields who prefer to remain abroad permanently after terminating their studies.

American Jesuits and International Education—the Future

Not every Jesuit university or college will judge itself capable of assisting an overseas institution or offering a large number of scholarships to non-Americans. Likewise, the number qualified to provide for an adult audience, on a sustained basis, seminars and lecture-discussions on non-Western cultures or the problems of developing nations is limited. No institution, however, should be so starved in resources of imagination and in commitment to its faculty and students as to be unable to offer a dimension in its curricula and other programs that can qualify as "international." It is to this consideration that the remaining parts of my discussion are directed; and, since an institution serious about the international dimension in education must weave it into its overall understanding of liberal education, must provide the type of professor who can embody it in the curriculum, and must be sufficiently organized to understand both what it purports to accomplish and what actually it does, my remarks will be limited to these three points.

If we Jesuits seriously maintain that our institutions are educating leaders, whether they be members of small governing elites in major power centers or self-directing adults able consistently to make responsible decisions in their life and work, we surely must reflect in our educational programs the fact that the world of the leaders of the next decades reaches much further than the tidy one of the "West." However "liberal education" is defined, it must be such as to prepare a student to respond intelligently as an adult to major religious, socio-cultural, political, and economic

⁸ See the Kelley Report, pp. 4-9.

issues of his world. These issues include the grim fact of malnutrition, hunger or starvation for a good part of the world's population; the jostling of local leaders in new African countries as they try to unify peoples to a loyalty larger than tribal; the delicate relations between world religions and modernization in almost every segment of the world; the flow of ideas and influences from centers formerly so remote as China, India, the United Arab Republic, and Africa: in short, a range of considerations that will only grow in urgency and complexity.

If the discovery of the printing press and the recovery by small bands of dedicated Renaissance scholars of the glories of Rome and the wisdom of Greece provided the sub-structure for the liberal education of the Jesuit schools from the sixteenth through the mid-eighteenth centuries, then the invention of television and the jet plane, with all their implications for consciousness of, and communication with peoples formerly distant, has set the stage for a new type of humanism. When the slow circulation of manuscripts gave way in the sixteenth century to the rapid diffusion of ideas through books, ever-increasing numbers of European students were enabled to walk with Tully in the Forum and live imaginatively in the golden days of Pericles. Today, man's mastery of the space-continuum brings New Delhi as close, culturally speaking, to San Francisco as the Stoa ever was to a European college. The "barbarian" of the Renaissance knew little Latin and less Greek. Is not his twentieth-century cousin he who remains innocently isolated from the social problems of developing countries as well as from the manifold achievements of the Islamic, Buddhist, Hindu, and Confucian worlds?

If the argument of the preceding paragraph is not intended to lead to the conclusion that every student in a Jesuit institution of higher learning in the United States should master an Asian tongue or specialize in government problems of developing nations, it does demand that their program include dimensions purposefully related to the non-Western world. How this is to be achieved at the individual institution depends on its educational philosophy. Some schools may be prepared to offer to all of their students semester or year courses similar to the Oriental Civilization and Humanities courses of Columbia College, the former centering on the development of the peoples of India, Pakistan, China, and Japan, the latter on some of their great works of re-

ligion, philosophy, and literature.⁹ Others may include in their required Philosophy or Theology courses sections on the answers of Confucius, Lao-Tze, Mencius, or Shankara to basic questions on the meaning of man, his relation to a personal source, his moral dilemmas, and the like. Others may see to it that required courses in social science or the humanities contain questions relating to man's ingenuity in devising styles of life so dissimilar as those of the Indian and Chinese or to his ability to sing of love and hate, birth and death, tears and laughter in words and forms that grip the heart and stir a response wherever man is man. Some institutions may make a deliberate effort to include a summer or semester of study in a center in another country in their ordinary program so that their students may enjoy the opportunity of learning different ways and customs *in situ*. One great advantage of well-directed programs of study abroad is that, immersed in a different culture, students are not able to shrug off the arts of the country as "exotic" and the problems as merely textbook "facts" or material for classroom discussion.

No matter how a college or university may seek to work an international dimension into its total program, the need for qualified professors cannot be minimized. Colleges especially, with no programs in Asian or African languages and with few specialists in the social sciences who have studied or lived abroad, may find that their resources are painfully limited. However, through judicious selection of new faculty members in the social sciences and humanities, an institution can systematically build up a core of professors whose preparation includes serious study of a non-Western culture or professional experience abroad. Heads of departments may decide to make a deliberate attempt to recruit some new members, born and educated in a different culture, for such teachers, no matter what their specialty, cannot help but infuse into their teaching some attitudes which will reflect a different structure of values or illustrate their lectures and discussions with

⁹ For a lucid description of the Columbia program see William Theodore de Bary's "Asian Studies for Undergraduates" in *International Education: Past, Present, Problems and Prospects*, pp. 155-160. Of particular interest is the rationale offered for the liberal orientation of the program, explained as follows: "The peoples and civilizations of Asia are important to undergraduate education, not because they represent factors in the cold war, as means to some immediate practical end, but because their experience in living together, what they have learned about life, and what they have come to understand about the universe we all live in is now part of the common human heritage. Nor are these people to be studied like problem children needing our help. They are to be studied, rather, as people who can teach us about ourselves, whose past can give us a new perspective on our own, and whose way of looking at things can challenge us to a re-examination of our own." (Pp. 156-157.)

examples that would not occur to a man born and educated in the United States.

Resourceful deans and department heads, intent on building an international dimension into their programs, can take the lead in encouraging their staff to use their sabbaticals for study in a foreign country. They must be realistic enough to anticipate that such a sabbatical may not lead to the publication of a research report or a book, particularly if it is carried on in a country as massively different from the States as are almost all in non-Western areas. A sociologist, for example, who spends some months in India may never be able to write a monograph in depth on the position of the cow in Hinduism, but his subsequent teaching cannot be untouched by seeing traffic in urban centers stop to allow cows to amble across a major thoroughfare. A philosopher, who lives in an Islamic country whose culture is styled on an Aristotelian appraisal of woman, may return with a far deeper appreciation of the way in which an understanding of person developed in the European interpretation of Aristotle than he had previously had. A professor of English who can live in a Japanese village while steeping himself in English translations of Japanese literature will find himself succumbing to the bewitchment of the lute on a moon-drenched night and will then perhaps for the first time find himself responding to that pensive *mono no aware* (the Japanese approximation of "Sunt lacrimae rerum") which pervades its prose and poetry.

In addition to NDEA and Fulbright grants for serious study of non-Western cultures by college professors, one type of opportunity that should be increasingly open to members of Jesuit institutions is a type of sabbatical at a Jesuit institution abroad. Some American Jesuits, lay staff members, and recent graduates have accepted a reduced teaching-load at a Jesuit university in the Philippines, Japan, Korea, or Iraq in return for opportunities of study, in addition of course to a modest salary. Although some of the participants have not been completely satisfied, reports which cross my desk indicate that both the contracting institution and the participant judge that the arrangement is beneficial. A middle-aged Jesuit, after several years of teaching in the States, wrote from his sabbatical home in Asia that the opportunity to work in a very different culture was "an all-things-new kind of *joy*. Just to get out of the rut and get a new perspective

on things." Such new perspectives normally lead to a higher quality of teaching after the man returns to his home campus.

Although a stay of one summer in a culture area markedly different from one's own may often bring with it all the frustrations attendant upon superficiality, it should not be overlooked as a possibility. A professor with a thorough knowledge of his own discipline can prepare long in advance to squeeze considerable profit out of a summer in a new area. His reading has acquainted him with the best study-opportunities available; his membership in professional societies opens many of the doors he wants to enter; months or even years of background reading on the target culture carry him quickly through shallow waters into the depths he wants to immerse himself in. Faculty members of Jesuit institutions can find sister schools in many countries and men willing to reflect with them on their discoveries and tentative interpretations. A rewarding summer abroad will often open the eyes of a teacher to resources near his home campus that he had previously not attended to: professors from other fields seeking, like himself, new understandings of their own disciplines through study of different but related areas. His own experience as a student in a foreign land may make him more sensitive to the situation of foreign nationals on his own campus and lead to his working with them as informants about their own culture. In many ways a well-planned summer abroad can open new perspectives.

An institution that competently seeks to weave international threads into the fabric of its normal teaching and, thus, shows its seriousness about broadening the meaning of "liberal education" cannot be unorganized in its efforts. Neither the gushiness of the dilettante nor the cynicism of the *laudator temporis acti* should be allowed to discourage administrative and academic leaders from so organizing their international effort that it can be sustained and grow. Sporadic efforts on the part of competent faculty are good. But more is needed, at least in the judgment of those who have surveyed and evaluated some of the best programs in the States.¹⁰

The international demands therefore make leadership—at least from president, trustees, deans and key faculty—both central and critical to an effective program. The role of the leadership is to make it continually clear—inward to the university community, outward to the public—that the international dimen-

¹⁰ de Bary, *op. cit.*

sion is a permanent, integral part of the university's total educational mission.

The authors of this passage identify two general ways in which coordination of international activities is actually carried on. The first is characterized by a deliberate attempt on the part of leading administrators, preferably working with faculty participation, to establish plans for bringing international elements into every part of the institution, while the second stresses the encouragement of individual professors or academic units which have already taken steps to this end in the hope that their influence will gradually permeate larger sectors of the institution.¹¹ Under any circumstances, they argue that the coordinating officer for international activities should have, and be known to have, ready access to the leading administrative officers of the institution.

Conclusion

Neither the will to provide the organizational underpinning for effective mobilization of an institution's resources for international education nor the sustained effort needed to provide a staff capable of infusing their teaching with an international dimension can be expected of administrators if they are not convinced that a "liberal" education today must include elements to prepare students for an intelligently full life in a polycultural world. The fact that university students today can find in pocket books the classics of the world's culture-shaping religions and literatures which a generation ago were hardly available in university libraries is an index of the many-layeredness of their world. Is it not also an indicator that Jesuit education needs an opening to the East and the South?

¹¹ *The University Looks Abroad: Approaches to World Affairs at Six American Universities* (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1965), quoted in *International Education: Past, Present, Problems and Prospects*, p. 529.

Staying Alive in High School

WILLIAM J. O'MALLEY, S.J.

*We are the hollow men
We are the stuffed men
Leaning together
Headpiece filled with straw. Alas!*

—T. S. Eliot, "The Hollow Men"

We are the second-class Jesuits, the Mets, the Norman Thomases, the Charlie Browns. We are the Inner Cities of the province. Give us your tired, your poor.

We are not really the Inner Cities of the province. How wonderful it would be if we could make ourselves as dramatic as *The Blackboard Jungle* or *East Side, West Side* or even *Mr. Novak*, noble fellows struggling against affluent ignorance, absentee landlords, sallying forth without enough money, without enough time, without wallet or scrip, with only truth and hope. But even Reginald Rose couldn't make a hero out of Father JS/07/M/378, whose school charges \$400 for an education which costs \$750 and is worth something else. There is nothing really dramatic about measuring out one's life in coffee spoons.

And yet, the high schools not only could be but must be dramatic. They can no longer be fact factories. The TV generation, nourished by Sputnik and Romper School and TIME will not settle for the old pre-packaged pap. They may be too inarticulate to protest vocally, but they get their point across by cutting class or falling asleep or flunking out. The competition from the mass media demands that high school be a time of openings, of premieres. Math must spark the realization of quantity and relationship and convergence, the way Walt Disney does it. History, literature, and language must open up the dignities and depravities of man's striving, the way *21st Century* does it. Writing must open the boy and release the man locked inside—as no TV program can.

How many of us, indeed, still find pressing need for quadratic equations or Shakespeare's dates or "*-us with -ris is neuter*"? It is one of those lip-served truisms that these are merely means toward opening the world of the mind to growth as a human person, to wondering hunger for knowledge and wisdom. But the less a

teacher is challenged to excellence and the more he is treated like a body in a classroom or a button on the schedule board and the longer he endures the Charleston marathon of high school teaching, the more he must substitute catechising for search. He becomes less trustful of the young mind, more eager for certainty that *he* has covered the matter but "*they* just didn't study". His work becomes a game rather than a quest. He makes the means into his end. In these circumstances, poking around for wisdom takes too much time, too much uncertainty, too much out of you.

The first time man's accumulated knowledge of his world doubled was in 1750. It redoubled 150 years later; then again 50 years later; then again 10 years later. This means that teachable material has doubled twice since Father Provincial was a regent at blissful Bobadilla Prep in 1945. For all I know it now doubles faster than one can print the news of it. After a few years, the high school teacher sits in his room and moans, "It's too much. It's just too much."

The visiting provincial or province prefect of studies knows this only indirectly. If they do look for the cause of our mediocrity, the only cause they see is the people. They see the F. Scott Fitzgerald priest with his hi-fi, skis, golf clubs, "caves"; the Lancelot priest whose dreams and plans are always light years beyond his schedule, his energy, and his talents; the IBM priest with his lesson plans, mnemonics, and capsulized placebos; the Jack Armstrong priest, the Mickey Spillane priest, the Graham Greene priest. What further need have they of testimony?

If the school is mediocre, the cause is, very truly, mediocre people. The question unasked perhaps is: why are the people mediocre? The phenomenon usually progresses something like this:

We come zooming out of tertianship ready to set this school moving at the pace the world moves at, only to encounter Jesuit educators who advise us to "wait and see what the public schools do," or "you'll settle down in a couple of years." Most of what we teach today could have and should have been taught yesterday, in the grammar school. The tuition we get today was spent yesterday. Who has time to think about the day after tomorrow, about the adult topics which already concern our students and the puerile language and logic which tongue-tie them? Who has time to read about faster more effective ways to cope with our prob-

lems, problems which others have solved long ago? The machine is moving. Just keep it moving.

Not willing to settle for this, in the unrealistic enthusiasm of liberation to work at 33, the ex-tertian streaks onward toward the brick wall. In order to meet the immediate needs of the boys, the call of the Inner City, the requests for Vatican II discussion groups, or merely to do his own *status* jobs professionally, some "inessentials" must almost reluctantly be jettisoned: first, professional reading, then spiritual reading, then prayer—or perhaps the other way around. Then, as the disillusionment sets in, objectivity and charity ease overboard, then enthusiasm, the grading of papers, and finally class preparation. The transformation is complete. He has settled down. He is ready for a parish or the mission band.

In my opinion the major proximate cause of this gradual atrophy is lack of reading. We are the culturally disadvantaged. While every Jesuit, from novice to retreat giver to theology professor, must by definition read, the high school Jesuit apparently does not. 95% of what he reads is actually a re-reading of the same popularized textbooks for tomorrow's class. Any other kind of reading, including the breviary and sometimes even the newspaper, requires time. In a 15-hour day, seven-day week of *ad hoc* activities, who has time for more? And yet unless we do, as Jesuits, as intellectuals, as human beings, we die. We become petulant zombies, the sages of the haustus room, capable of oral treatises on the rector's shortcomings, golf grips, the bad boys, and why Fr. Sourpuss was changed from Torpid High to St. Glumhilda's parish.

In contrast, the high school teacher hears rumors that college teachers (trained exactly as he was) have no more than 12 or 15 classes each week (compared to his 20 or 25). He hears they have time to read and to write; only one extra-curricular, if any; relatively few papers to grade (compared to his 185 daily quizzes, monthly essays, term papers, bi-weekly tests, etc., provided he is still gung-ho enough to give them). He hears that college teachers have no home rooms, bazaars, magazine drives, mission boxes. He is awed by the fact that they have paid lab assistants, that they are respected as educators, not teachers. But most of all he sighs for the time to keep growing if he still wants to. And the teaching scholastics, too eager for self-fulfillment, set their range finders for the greener pastures.

The good high school teacher does not want to be a college teacher. He realizes that he gets young people at a far more malleable part of their growing. He merely chafes that all Jesuits are equal, but some are more equal than others. It's amusing how our image of college life conjures up tree-shaded lanes with professors smoking pipes, while our image of high school is a tile-and-vinyl blur.

This paper will sound like a list of gripes, but unless we come openly to grips with gripes, they spread sourly underground. Without painful viewing of facts, without criticism and reassessment, neither schools nor individuals can grow. One of these painful facts is how high school teachers feel about the conditions under which they must work. Maybe they should not feel the way they do. That isn't the problem. The problem is that they *do* feel this way. I believe it is time to bring the gripes out of the haustus room.

Digging for the Tap Root

The Society has been parodied as an inexorable machine grinding out look-alike, think-alike, act-alike automatons flawlessly executing a common task. It has been fearsomely sketched as a steel-minded military cadre moving in the vanguard of the Church with terrifying efficiency and despatch, its officers icily aware of every jot and tittle, moving each eager pawn with utmost accuracy and effectiveness. It has been sung by retreat masters as a mother who metamorphoses her sons into a Maccabean family bound together by love of the Conquering King and of one another.

It is slightly shocking today to realize—if we are willing to be honest—that the poisoned tap root of our high school problems is lack of any comprehensive organization. In fact, no superior has any real idea of what he is asking of a man when he sends him to a high school, unless he himself has recently taught college courses in grammar school, twenty-five hours a week.

Do superiors realize, for instance, that in religion, history, English, math, and science, the junior and senior year now study what freshman and sophomore college students studied ten years ago? That our seniors are reading such books as *The Secular City*, *The Federalist Papers*, *Portrait of the Artist*, *The Divine Milieu*? That they are taking advanced calculus, matrix algebra,

atomic physics? That, willy nilly, we are the sudden beneficiaries of the TV-Sputnik-sitdown-computer-paperback-mushroomcloud era? That the questions asked in high school are no longer a-b-c, but probing essays on subjects like: conformity or rebellion, the genesis of modern-day political liberalism, the Death of God controversy? That the boys' religious questions are no longer merely, "How far can I go?" but also, "How can a man preserve his personal authenticity in a bureaucratic Church?"

On the other hand, while the courses are moving into the old college level, the schedule for each teacher is still back in the little red schoolhouse. We teach from twenty to twenty-five periods, four or five classes, of thirty-five boys each, just as they did in the good old days when men didn't complain. But the matter has quadrupled, the raw material is more sophisticated, and the teacher has had a better education. In the good old days a teacher had a couple of Latin classes and a couple of Religion (read: "catechism explanation") classes to offset an English class. Now an English teacher has four English classes, so that each assignment of compositions means twenty-five to thirty hours of grading, over and above class time, preparation, testing, activities, meetings. James Bryant Conant, in *The American High School Today*, says each student should write one composition each week. Obviously he *visited* American high schools. He didn't try teaching in one.

Finally, do superiors realize that the teachers who do try to gear their classes to the sophisticated problems that torture today's youth and *at the same time* to correcting their inability to grasp all that they read or to express all that they wonder about—that these teachers just don't have time even to keep up, much less to grow? That the demands are often too much even to allow for recreation or a shower, much less for reading, reflection, or prayer?

This disorganization, this ignorance of what high school teachers and students must do, feeds the other great roots of deterioration in our high schools: (1) mediocrity of achievement, (2) lack of communication, (3) lack of money, (4) unreal schedules, (5) lack of motivation, and (6) disunion. And their effect on the individual priest, trying to keep his schedule and keep alive at the same time, is disastrous.

(1) Mediocrity vs. Imagination

It would be easier for all of us if a high school teacher would be content merely to teach the three R's which the grammar schools didn't teach. But the students won't let him. They cry, "Quality!" and their parents echo it, and, with appalling lack of perception, so do upper-level Jesuit educators. These men want quality at the old cost, with the old schedules, and with the old number of pupils per teacher. Our claims of quality (and the tuition tag we put on what we give) just doesn't take account of our actual schools.

The great lumbering behemoths which are our schools have somehow been set in motion in the past, and each new *status-change* brings new men whose job is, apparently, merely to maintain whatever momentum the great beast had at their arrival. In 100 years few high schools of ours have grown into anything much different from their secular and parochial younger sisters. We are not the vanguard any more, not especially effective, not a family. We are not leaders or innovators, but co-plodders. Maybe we do have greater talent on our faculties, but it runs in all different directions, or sits down to die, for lack of coordination and teamwork. Even worse, the private schools of vision and daring, which are solving the problems of quality and quantity and money, are not named after Jesuit saints. Understandably, vision and daring are virtues rarely found where all energy is spent in merely surviving.

With few exceptions our schools are not challenging the other schools in their areas. But more important to the theme of this article, they are not challenging the men they have working in them. We owe these men a job limited enough to be humanly possible and to allow some leisure time in which to continue growing. We owe them a working situation which challenges their creativity and justifies the expenditure of their talents and energy for the rest of their lives, one which also justifies their minimum of 27 years of formal education. We owe them a call of Christ which is stronger, more significant, more demanding, and, in the long run, more productive to Christ's people than the call of Christ in the Inner City and South America. The needs of urban and suburban Catholic boys are just as bad as those of the great trouble spots, and they have less chance of Federal or Church help. These boys are just as pagan, just as ignorant, just

as groping. But it is perhaps easier to walk away from the mess than to clean it up. Maybe we'd do better in the Inner City. Maybe.

Of course we can teach wealthy (or poor) sub-literates, but the pity of it is that others have been better trained for that job than we, and they offer it at a lower price. Of course we could abandon our high schools and swell our colleges and parishes, but what of the superior students who cannot be challenged in a general high school program, who have the talent but not the money or family prestige for Exeter? Although we have no right to be inordinately proud of the way our own are facing today's demands, truly quality high schools are an enterprise we are eminently capable of, provided we can organize our schools—and exercise a bit of imagination and daring.

(a) Courage

A few people in each province talk of innovations which would set our schools apart: year-round classes, night classes for parents, gradeless high schools, the four-module class day, five-track courses—and daring ways to finance them. But at the end of the sessions, these ideas wind up in the barrel with the beer cans.

Instead of the inbred feeding which makes the high school principals the automatic consultants of the province prefect, why not choose the thinking men from each high school (no matter how adverse or disparate their ideas) as a consulting group to meet one long weekend each semester with the province prefect? Why not schedule a faculty meeting before each of the high school consultants' meetings? Most faculty meetings I have attended are less colorful and more fruitless than class meetings. Why not reward the people who are still thinking by giving them a forum? Who knows? It might even keep them thinking. It might even keep them alive.

In the light of the foregoing, perhaps we need a refinement of the accusation of disorganization; call it rather a need for informed coordination. The problem is rather that overnight our schools have grown into great hydras, with more facets, more demands, more depth than ever before. They are *not remotely* like the schools our superiors taught in as regents. And yet our superiors have not the channels by which all the information can be funneled up to them in some assimilable and assessable form. We

run our schools on chance meetings in the corridor or at dinner and a few hurried head-thrust-in-the-door communiqués. Superiors cannot organize comprehensively without comprehensive information. Unfortunately we know they *can* make decisions and act without it.

Just as he seldom knows how many class hours a high school priest has, the superior—even the local superior—rarely knows whether his subject reads anything stronger than *LIFE* and Mickey Spillane. Many conduct the yearly manifestation as quickly and cursorily as possible in order to save everyone from embarrassment. Most of us have had a superior tell us we're working too hard, and leave it at that, or worse, call up next week and ask us to take on a speaking assignment.

Knowledge of his men is paramount for a superior, but it takes courage to ask the right questions, and ask them early when there is obviously less solid ground for asking them. Do they pray? Are they professionals or merely functionaries, and what can be done to re-fire them? Merely transferring a man, like moving a sleeping dog, results only in a re-snuggling somewhere else after a brief period of snarling adaptation. And what superiors' conference, with any practical results, has ever attacked the great question: what do we do with men who have given up? Are our parishioners and retreatants less intelligent than high school boys, or only less intolerant? Are the aggressive parish priests and missionaries always going to suffer for our failure to motivate priests, just as the public schools must suffer for our failure to motivate boys?

(b) Discerning and Pooling Talent

With the amount of knowable matter doubling every time we wake up, it is a tautology to say no man can be an expert, even a dabbler, in all areas of human knowledge. We bow to this in the back of our minds, but out in front, out in the high schools, we somehow expect ourselves and our superiors to be priest-theologian-philosopher-scientist-litterateur-financier-father-president.

Both superiors and individuals must accept the fact that we cannot do everything well; that we must pool our resources and skills, assess the needs of our students, and limit ourselves to that goal; that if we try too many projects, as schools or as indi-

viduals, the results will range downward from "less poor" to "humiliating".

Each teacher, each member of the community has an enthusiasm and a talent all his own, and he should have the freedom to amplify it. If there is anything we do not want and cannot market today it is that lock-step thinking and teaching of which our forebears are accused. At the same time, however, this freedom cannot be allowed to erupt in all directions without coordination. Still, if the authorities can set up the mechanisms to discern and channel the talents of individuals, we can have both the freedom and the discipline of members of a growing organism.

(2) Lack of Communication

In the school, we have separate curricula for each course, but we must also have monthly department meetings to adapt them and reshape their progress. Otherwise we are either Daleks grinding out the old syllabus or will o' the wisps flitting nowhere and back, without any regard for the actual needs of the boys. On the other hand, the man who says, "I don't choose to use that text," is cheating not only the boys who paid for it, but also the later teachers who will presume its insights. It is our students and colleagues who pay the price of a teacher's placing his own needs above those of the boys. We have to fight for what we think is needed but, once the group consensus is formed, we have to cooperate. From now on it is up to the department head to seek and form the consensus of his teachers; up to the principal to coordinate the consensus of departments; and so on up the line to the provincial—provided everyone has the time.

I would suggest one addition to our faculty rosters where it does not already exist: an assistant principal, a man who is neither registrar nor prefect of discipline. He should take the "hairy" jobs like scheduling, interviewing failing boys and wailing parents, and leave the principal free to fire the enthusiasm of teachers and boys, to gather ideas and put them into workable form, to coordinate.

We must reverse our image of the source of ideas in our schools. Rather than fountains where all ideas come from the central administrative source, our schools must be like orchestras in which each member does what he knows how to do better than the leader does, but always under the ultimate guidance of the au-

thorities who know the score and the men well enough to keep the music growing. We must always remember: all the authority is on the side of the director; all the ideas, however, are not.

Of course either lock-step obedience or untrammelled individuality is easier to explain and work out in practice than the imaginative, creative coordination of individualists working as a team. Informed coordination requires endless, sometimes boring meetings of committees and conferences between individuals. And, most difficult of all, it takes concession and compromise, on both sides. Unfortunately we have been trained to consider compromise equivalent to surrender. Furthermore, our lives as bachelors tempt us to cling to the death to little bits of self-assertion, as if we would cease to be persons without them. Finally, the whole psychological and social upthrust of recent years has demanded an uncompromising individuality in the face of the monstrous leveler, conformity. But compromise is not conformity. It is balance.

"Good will" used to be the greatest asset a superior could see in a subject. Now it has become a most dangerous asset indeed. On the one hand a man of good will but no talent will gladly teach a full load in any field, filling up that empty slot and cheating two or three classes of the quality education they paid quality money for. On the other hand, the man of both good will and talent finds himself on a Sunday night in February staring into a miasmic week of limitless commitments, not knowing how to organize them or even where to begin. Today in the Society, the man who will never say No is as much a potential frustrate as the man who has forgotten how to say Yes.

(3) Lack of Money

If there is any single result of disorganization which is most responsible for the living death of a high school Jesuit it is lack of money. Nothing kills the progress or excitement of education more than the yearly hiring of unpromising lay teachers because they are the only ones who will take our salary. Without money, the Jesuits teach 20-25 periods per week, etc., etc., because we can't afford to hire more laymen. Without money the eager-beaver ex-tertian spends hours taping French records rather than buying them, typing stencils rather than hiring a secretary, staging plays in the gym on library tables. It's great to be poor, and there is almost a joyful excitement in making-do, but not when the athletic budget and cafeteria go \$10,000 in the hole.

The greatest fallacy in this area is that a Jesuit high school must support itself by tuition. If this is the rule, it is one of the few great rules which are proved by 100% exceptions. When will we realize that our present tuition set-up will never support our high schools any more than Harvard University would be supported by its tuition? The tried-and-false solution is inevitable and sacrosanct: raise the tuition and lower the number of lay teachers; raise the number of students and lower the entrance requirements.

Why is it impossible to consider a sliding scale for tuition? Of course we would have to give an education worth seven hundred dollars more than the public school gives, a Choate-Groton-Kent education, and that would mean quite a bit of vision and daring—like that of the Fordham Three-Three Program.

But even if that seems beyond our reach, what of adding a seventh and eighth grade to our schools, restricted to the best talent we could find? This would lower the number and raise the quality of the boys in our high schools and ease admissions searches. It would give us a chance to teach the grammar and linguistics that we now have to cover (too late) in freshman year. And the possibility of a speeded-up program and of advanced placement or advanced standing would be partial justification of higher tuition. Whatever we do, we must reassess our educational reach. We cannot continue to give just about the same education for two hundred dollars more. Hitherto we have been extorting higher prices because we needed the money and not because the product had improved.

Why would it be impossible—if only to establish peace—to have a financial conference twice a year for the whole community?

We are no longer, at least chronologically, adolescents. Moreover, unlike stagnant security, poverty is not a matter of never worrying about money. For most poor people, poverty is a matter of being very strongly aware of debits and credits, down to the last farthing. For a religious, it should be a matter not only of trust but of involved concern. Many of us are so ignorant of balancing budgets that we do not fully realize that tiny bills, like paper and light and sneakers, add up to exorbitant bills. Perhaps if we all knew precisely the community's financial standing, we could suggest significant cutbacks.

Why can there not be a province begging office for the high

schools, just as there is for the missions and for the seminaries? Major gifts to education are just as much needed. Local superiors are too confined to local problems to do the job of fund raising adequately, short of a major, alienating fund drive. And the great anomaly of dealing with foundations is that, the greater the sum you request, the more chance you have of getting it. But the foundations don't want merely to plug our dikes. They want to back something imaginative.

If we cannot spare a man to be the rector's moneyman, and we cannot spare another to be the province beggar for high schools, we must at least have a five-year financial plan known to the community and actively fostered by it. Let us begin to look beyond today.

If I know very little about high school financing, it is because I have been told very little. The point is that the subjects do know these headaches in one very real way: they have to work with their painful results, and have no idea why. This is the hardest part: to live in the dark with rumor, to suspect ineptitude where it may or may not exist, to be totally outside, as if we were unsalaried personnel, and all the while to adhere to a gradually deadening schedule no college Jesuit would put up with.

Finally, the academic functions of the school *are* dependent on the financial functions, but they should never be secondary to them. If they are, we are running a business, and we should turn that side over to businessmen who know more about it than we, and who well might see that an improvement in the product ordinarily improves the market. Gone are the days when a priest who was good at bookkeeping or a superior with a moderately good eye for stocks could manage a school's finances alone. We are now multi-million dollar plants. It is not so unthinkable that we might have a lay board of trustees who will assume responsibility for our financial growth. It is no longer a job for men of orderly habits, piety, and good will.

(4) Unreal Schedules

No doubt an impossible plea: fewer classes and the motivation to use the freed time for professional growth. It seems that as soon as a higher superior sees men teaching (a) fewer than 20 hours a week (b) with fewer than 35 boys in a class in (c) a high school which is, inevitably, in debt, he cries, "Over-

staffed!" He would not dream or dare to give a college professor more than 15 hours. The college professor has to have time to read, to prepare classes, to confer with colleagues and students, in short to keep alive—which suggests to the cynical high school teacher that a penny-ante pedagogue like himself need not do any of these things.

Does it take longer to work out a lecture to college Juniors or to work out a Socratic dialogue with pseudo-sophisticated high school Juniors? Are college professors content with the quality of freshman we send them? Can these kids observe, read, analyze, write, assimilate as you would hope them to? If not, could you teach them these basic educational insights and skills for 20-25 hours per week, 35 in a class, in a six-to-eight-subject curriculum, without the time to prepare more than rough notes or to grade more than every third or fourth essay? If we want to lower the numbers of students who need remedial work in college, it is essential that we make a full-scale, no-holds-barred reassessment of the high school set-up—not by administrators only but by teachers as well.

Why is it that Andover and Kent have become endowed and academically excellent? It could not be that they have more vision and daring and higher motives than the sons of St. Ignatius. Why is it that educational conferences always single out such high schools as New Trier in Chicago (where families move into the school district just so that their children can attend the school), Newton in Boston (whose excellence has drawn Harvard to take it under its wing for experimental programs), Melbourne in Florida (where a gradeless high school was going strong long before most Jesuits ever heard of the concept)? None of these schools is older than St. Louis U. High or Canisius in Buffalo or Regis in New York.

Perhaps one reason our men fail to stay alive is that, as one longtime lay teacher said when leaving our school for another, "They're a growing concern, and we're not. I want to be part of a school that is reaching, challenging. I only have one life to give." What challenges do we offer, other than survival?

Another possible reason why other schools succeed where we seem to fail is that they are staffed entirely by laymen. A good lay teacher is also a breadwinner who can be wooed away by a higher salary and a better schedule, as we know. Consequently

these schools do pay him a salary commensurate with his work and involvement, and they have not necessarily studied the Papal encyclicals. Moreover, the administrators of these schools can never take such teachers or their work or their complaints or their shortcomings for granted. Yet simple mathematics shows that our lay teachers could make more money as union ditch diggers, with as much hope of advancement and with more time to read.

Somehow we have to find a financial and organizational way to keep teachers down to 15 hours each week, at least in junior and senior years. Teaching a college-level Advanced Placement class should mean at least some lessening of schedule. The five-track system, which allows the top two levels class-time for research, or some variation of the Trump plan should offer at least areas for discussion to administrators. Or are we waiting till "all the other guys" commit themselves before we do?

We have to find the information and the courage to *limit* our men, especially just after tertianship, to works they can handle with competence, flair, and reasonable coordination. Much as we would like to, we cannot give weekend retreats twice a month; we have to be content with the less dramatic but far more permanent impact of our work on the next generation. Much as we would like to, we cannot give most of our "free" time to the Inner City; we have to be content with the less dramatic job of training the politicians, sociologists, architects, newspapermen who will transform the Inner City. For the present, we can multiply ourselves by sending our Sodalities to work in our place. Rectors must convince their men that all the work will never be done, but that the only way to make a lasting impression on it is to carve out the segment we can do best and do that with a passion.

Finally, the daily order, though few observe it, is still on our bulletin boards and still little different from the order we followed as novices. We neither rise, nor retire, nor recreate, nor make examen at the times the bulletin board advertises. In the interests of truth, utility, and sanity, superiors should reconsider the house order. One arguable format:

7:30—Rise

11:30-1:00—Buffet Lunch

5:00—Bell rings for all students to leave the school. The Jesuits

come back to the house, shower, relax, maybe say a bit of Office.

5:30—Prayer in common or in private

6:00—Concelebrated Mass

6:45—Preprandials

7:15—Dinner

8:00—Back to work. We have already had recreation together for two hours. And unlike the TV room where we all stare in the same direction, we have looked at one another.

(5) Motivation

(a) Natural Motivation

"Softer" schedules alone are not the answer. In fact they are usually disastrous alone. Teachers freed from too many classes and the preparation involved in them quite often spend an excessive amount of time at coffee klatsches discussing last Saturday's football game or, in the evening, watching "The Invaders".

Few high school teachers are rewarded by promotions or even by the recognition that they have done their work, much less that they have done it well. The only real praise we hear is, "You're working too hard. You'll kill yourself." Gradually then, the work is cut down, from the feverish commitment of the early years to something far more manageable. And this is the critical moment in a teacher's life; when his relaxation toward a realistic work-week either finds the precarious balance between effusion and apathy or, frequently, plummets past it into minimalism, security, and the five-hour day with tenure. One of the least expensive motivations is praise, and our rectors and principals should spend a good deal of their time discovering causes for praise and inventing ways to give it publicly.

Other motivations are close at hand, and discovering them should be a major task of the house discussion groups and committees. Joining local teachers' groups is one. It is amazing how a man who feels his ideas are jejune can come away from such meetings feeling he is not such a dullard after all. Visiting other schools is another similar way. Subject-area meetings across province lines would cross-fertilize not only ideas but enthusiasms.

Motivating the Jesuits is an even greater problem than motivating the laymen. Humanly speaking we are not different from any other men. After fifteen years of this "marriage", expressions

of love and commitment can become cursory, habitual, taken for granted. Both subject and superior can draw further and further apart, ignorant of one another's practical problems, calloused to one another's inner wrestlings, waiting for time and the *status* to heal all wounds, to carry off all troublemakers.

It is naive to think that in most cases the Long Retreats or even the exhilaration of ordination will carry a man through the years from thirty to sixty without any other assistance than a yearly retreat, made alone, going over the same routine Exercises without the expanded perceptiveness which a year of experience, reflection, and reading could bring to a new retreat.

We ask our rectors to pull us together, not only by periodic reminders that we are doing a good job, but by asking *each* of us to do a particular job for something like the school bazaar. Don't just ask the ones you are sure will always respond well. Don't leave anyone out. Don't just put a volunteer sign on the board the night before. Look at us as individuals and use us creatively, tapping the unique capabilities, noticing us as persons—which is irresistible bait, even to the so-called sluggards. This is creative leadership, not as easy as asking the old standbys, but a way to keep your men alive, involved, and valuable.

Without realizing it, every human being craves love—or at least attention. Without realizing it, he craves success and applause—or at least attention. Without realizing it, he craves a word of thanks—or at least attention.

During the fifteen-year course there is always a goal rising out of the mists ahead: vows, philosophy, regency, theology, ordination, tertianship, first *status*. Then, nothing. There are no more rungs. We are *at* the top, and after a couple of years that sounds more and more ludicrous. Unless a man is slated to be a superior, he has no goals other than the ones he sets himself. But, to take an extreme analogy, it is difficult after a few years to sit out in the desert and congratulate yourself for building the biggest sand castle in the world.

We undersell tangible motivations. We want cooperation, union, enthusiasm, but we can't find ways of promoting them. We try to legislate them, beg for them, to no avail. We don't realize that, like love, they must grow slowly, by mutual giving. Things as disparate as concelebration in the community and a committee meeting ending with drinks are means. We claim man is a social animal, and yet we rest content that his social life, as far as we

see it, is satisfied by litanies, dinner, and "charitable recreation". God save us when recreation must always be hard work, charitable in that novitiate sense where the only real charity was for people you disliked. Is it any wonder that some of our men have more "caves" than Alley Oop? Other than the reward of the next world, what help do we give our men to realize they are worthwhile? We all admire the endurance of the little priest in *The Power and the Glory*, but we often have little more external (or at times internal) conviction of value than he had. When was the last time a rector or principal congratulated one of his men for a well-decorated dance? Or even knew that he ran it? Or that there had even been one? Some rectors usually manage to miss the debate tourney and the school play, less frequently the varsity football games. The high school teacher sometimes finds himself thanked by "self-centered teenagers", but how often by his peers? Or by his father?

(b) Supernatural Motivation

Without a change in schedule, it is utterly unrealistic to expect the high school teacher to pray in the same way a novice does or even as a theologian or an administrator. Unlike the administrator, he has no office he can lock and return to his room. His room is really an office with a bed and sink in it. The impossibility and the fatuity of the old "daily order" cry out for something to take their place. They are forms, once again, which no longer produce their intended function, but are kept around like family heirlooms. But in rejecting all the now-impossible forms, except offering Mass, the young Jesuit also rejects the indispensable function of union with the Reason for all his work. Subtly, he begins to substitute either success or serenity as the center of his strivings, rather than Jesus Christ.

For some, acts of piety like the rosary and visits are something of a substitute for reflective prayer, and perhaps it is far better than mere good intentions and self-laceration that "I should pray, but . . ." By far the greatest substitute, though, is the rationalization that *laborare est orare*. This is certainly true, but it leaves us little different from the generous atheist social worker. We are more like sailors who go off for a year on our schooners in order to support the wife and family with whom we talk for a whole week, once a year.

Moreover, meditative prayer has more than a religious value. Without it, we lose the habit and eventually the ability to think for ourselves. We take our opinions from TIME, the haustus room, and Madison Avenue. We limit our involvement in the school to the minimum demanded by the principal. Without reflection and reading, our minds are like over-used soil, with only accidental siltings of new insight. Stagnation takes the place of love.

(6) Disunion

Every house has a monthly conference, which seems to be a misnomer since only one person speaks—although “confer” might be used in the sense of “bestow”. In these periods, the rector could propose for free-wheeling discussion such topics as we have discussed above: realistic scheduling, the commitment of the school and community to the city, bolder ways of financing the school, reading, motivation, prayer. Perhaps if we found out concretely that we all share the same problems, we might honestly work together for a solution. Above all, the rector should show himself in these conferences as the leader, the father—but a father of lions, not sheep; of adults, not children.

(a) Casus

Every month the priests are called upon to endure “*casus moralis et liturgicus*”. Often it will be a tape recording, the vacuity of whose voice is outstripped only by the boredom of its listeners. Since the school is our means of sanctification and our main contact with moral and liturgical situations, this monthly conference could include not only priests but scholastics, the laymen and their wives, if they care to come. It could be the Monthly Faculty Lecture Series. First, in any city large enough to have a Jesuit school, there is a sociologist, a psychiatrist or psychologist, a secular administrator who would be happy to come in and discuss the very real moral and intellectual problems of today’s youth. Second, these same professional men could give us first-hand insight into the way an educated-specialist layman views the modern Church. And after all, we are training the next generation of educated-specialist laymen. Third, moralists and Scripture scholars from our houses or from the local diocesan seminary would, I hope, be happy to speak on the most recent developments in their branches of theology. If we were willing to admit that,

by now, we are no more than highly trained "lay" theologians, not professionals, we might even invite interested parents of our students. Fourth, a college teacher in charge of liturgy who seems to have some kind of success with involving young men in the Mass might share with us some ways to fill the frightening gap between our students and the sacraments.

These people could tell us, in an hour, the core of a subject we might take two or three weeks to find, in dribs and drabs from a book—even if we were still reading. But these lectures must be substituted into the old "*casus*" framework. A sign saying "Lecture Tonight" is pretty much equal to "Who wants to go out to dinner tonight?"

(b) Liaisons

Would it be possible for the college theology teachers to draw up a list of ten books every year specifically chosen to keep the high school teacher abreast of recent developments in theology, especially pastoral theology? The books would have to be chosen with the full knowledge that the reader has little time, is not an expert, and yet has most of the basic knowledge that lists like *America's* cannot presume but not the background for *Theological Studies*. Perhaps another caution: the books should be readable, almost popular in style, as Bruce Vawter's are. When a man can find only, say, a half-hour in the eye of his hurricane for reading anything, it has to be through an immediately accessible style. It is a hard task to find such books, of course, since so few theologians write for such an audience, but the task is far easier for a professional theologian than for someone who frequently does not have time even for the morning paper. But it is eminently worthwhile. This bibliography might be luring even one teacher to John McKenzie instead of Ed McBain.

Furthermore, could there not also be some college professor appointed in the province, in each subject area, whose job would include setting up a cooperative exchange of ideas in that field between college departments and high school departments? We work in such isolation from one another that no one would suspect we are preparing students for four years in one institution to spend four years in the other institution. Have the colleges got time for us? Have we the time to find out where we're going?

Still further, could there not be a man chosen on the province level to oversee the entire educational operation of the course from

novitiate to the tomb? It is not absolutely inconceivable that province prefects of studies could convince, say, philosophate faculties by forced high school visits that they are training men who will eventually come out to teach in our schools. Some educator could be appointed, answerable only to Fr. Provincial, who would spend months living and even working in each of our high schools, reading the future needs of the regents, and passing the information on to the philosophate. Likewise he could keep the theologians who are interested in returning to high school abreast of the changing depths and shades they will encounter when they return. Since no one man really knows what is being taught simultaneously in each of the levels of the course, including regency, isn't it about time there was? He would probably end up being the most important member of the Provincial's "Curia", which would at last take on the form of a Cabinet. This man might also goad local superiors into keeping their "finished" men from thinking they had completed their education when they completed The Course.

Finally, let us train our men to teach in the high schools. If they are intended for high school, do not let them think that the MA they are now getting is preparing them for the pleasant groves of Academe. Far better they know the goal while they are studying for it. Better that they write their theses on something other than "The Disappearance of the Umlauted 'U' in High Middle Frisian".

(c) Committees

Would it be possible to set up a committee on the school and a committee on the community whose members were not chosen by superiors but elected by the people involved: scholastics, priests, and brothers? Their suggestions would be only consultative, but at least it would be a way to find a consensus, to disseminate truth rather than rumor, to elicit potential improvements and difficulties a superior would have no way of foreseeing. And these people should not be the same *ex officio* people or "safe" people who are usually made house consultants.

The committee on the community could consider: the varying values of possible expenditures, domestic help, ways to make the liturgy and the house order and the physical appurtenances of the house pull the community together rather than drive them out to "caves". One very practical service of this committee could be to

contact a team of doctors from among the friends and parents of a school to set up an assembly-line physical check-up one night a year for every member of the community.

The committee on the school (lay as well as Jesuit) could consider the hierarchy of needed expenditures, the gap between the student needs and our performance, duplication by departments, schedules, team teaching, outside lecturers who would both inject new views and relieve teachers, six-week exchange of instructors between our high schools and colleges.

Let all these discussions and committees be fearless and free-wheeling. Let the emotions and gripes and misunderstandings pour out to be objectivized and made realistic rather than hidden and hyperbolic. Let the discussions even be personal. Without chapter and admonitions, we have few other ways short of an ultimate blow-up by which to discover our shortcomings. Can we realize, at long last, that we can find fault with people and with the Society and still love them deeply?

All these meetings should end up in the haustus room, so that the differences though fully recognized are seen to be differences among friends.

(d) Teachers' Meetings

The major purpose of these ordinarily debilitating sessions should be to *excite* teachers. Let the other committees seek out consensus on trivial matters like timing of holidays and such. If the principal cannot excite teachers, he should invite speakers who can. He should trust in our intelligence and good will that even an argument without final consensus is productive. It has at least stirred up the sludge.

These meetings, too, should be free-wheeling. So many teachers, especially laymen, perhaps rightly believe that candor will cost them their jobs. But teachers' meetings should fearlessly discuss our actual professional involvement in education, what teachers do with their free time, and very simply: "what are our major gripes". One very worthwhile session or more would be the introduction of a Group Dynamics team to give us a few lessons on creative thinking. So much progress has been made in this area and it has worked so well for corporate business that it is shattering to realize how few Jesuits have even heard of it.

One of the major tasks of department chairmen's meetings should be inter-departmental cooperation. In the past year at McQuaid,

we inundated our classes with term papers, all due of course at the end of the same term. There is no reason why a paper in any other discipline should not also be acceptable for English too. There is no reason why a single common topic could not be worked out for Religion, history, and English: Job, Shakespeare, Milton, Jonathan Edwards, Chesterton, Chardin.

Outside speakers, for students could be invited under the aegis of several departments, for instance, a scientist speaking on the causes of his belief in God or why articulateness is important to his work—or even why science drove him *out* of the Church. I would hope we are past the stage where we are sheltering students from ideas they can hear any night on television.

These meetings could make some inroads on team teaching possibilities. Why should the American Lit teacher “cover” the Civil War background of “The Andersonville Trial” or *The Red Badge of Courage* while the American History teacher is “covering” the New England Transcendentalist writers? Each could do the other’s job better at that moment, save time and research, and show quite clearly the inter-relationship of the two disciplines. But doing this requires communication, vision, organization, concession, trust, and above all, planning time.

An Overdue Conclusion

Because quality education has become a matter of prohibitive costs trying to provide quality teachers, texts, ETV, science equipment; because major state support of Catholic schools is not likely; because the financial generosity of Catholics must have an ultimate limit in the other needs of their own families—perhaps we will face within this aeon the necessity either of merging somehow into the secular or diocesan school systems, or of incorporating ourselves under lay management as the religiously founded prep schools of New England did in the last century, or of turning our schools entirely over to the federal government and going to South America.

It is my opinion, however, that our smaller colleges are less capable of unique contribution to education than our high schools are, especially since there is little or no condemnation today for attending a secular university. We have men at hand working in the high schools who are as well trained as those staffing the best prep schools and high schools in the country. We have even more

men working in our colleges who might do far better work in a really advanced prep school, but they don't even know what we are doing and what we are trying to do. Many of us have had freshmen return from our colleges to tell us that these institutions are a step backward from the work they have already done in high school. Youngsters today are far more fact-filled, and they are looking for answers *now* which the colleges are reserving to themselves. Informed coordination, courageous pruning and imaginative realignment could make our high schools more valuable to the Church and the nation than all but a few of our colleges are.

But if we ultimately do decide to close our high schools or cut back on them, we still have an obligation, until that time, to give our present students an education which is worth \$400 more than a public education, and an obligation to justify the expenditure of talented men, and a long-range task of preparing institutions we are not ashamed to transfer to others.

Let me conclude by quoting Fr. Herbert Musurillo, S.J.:

. . . it is a common fallacy for deans and headmasters to show off to visiting inspectors their array of visual aids, the latest equipment, TV, splendid library facilities, and the new gym. But my question has always been: where are the teachers, what has been their training and background, how good are they, are they encouraged, and are they well paid? The good school must be chiefly known by the splendid, productive tension that exists between faculty and student.

—in *Fordham*, March 1967, p. 16

*We are the hollow men
We are the stuffed men
Leaning together
Headpiece filled with straw. Alas!*

JUL 1968

WESTERN

BOSTON COLLEGE



3 9031 033 36161 9

397805

